

## COLONIAM DEDUCERE. COLONISATION AS AN INSTRUMENT OF THE ROMAN POLICY OF DOMINATION IN ITALY IN THE 3<sup>RD</sup> AND 2<sup>ND</sup> CENTURIES BC, AS ILLUSTRATED BY SETTLEMENTS IN THE *AGER GALLICUS* AND PICENUM

Maciej Piegdoń

Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Kraków

**Abstract:** This article is an attempt to present the role of colonisation in the Roman policy of expansion towards its Italian neighbours in the 3<sup>rd</sup>–2<sup>nd</sup> BCE and showing the effects of this phenomenon, as illustrated by settlements in the *Ager Gallicus* and Picenum. Information on the founded colonies in sources, appearing somewhat on the margins of accounts of military activities and diplomatic missions in Italy (*foedera*), but also connected with the internal policy conducted by Rome (grants of land), may indicate that colonisation complemented such activities. This complementary character of the process of colonisation in relation to other political, military, diplomatic, and internal activities seems to be an important feature of the Republic's activities.

**Key words:** Roman colonisation, Roman Republic, Ager Gallicus, Picenum, Roman conquest.

Roman colonisation during the Republic was a phenomenon that even ancient writers perceived as one of the fundamentals of the Roman domination of Italy.<sup>1</sup> Contemporary historians are equally impressed, but there are also numerous controversies regarding its motives and reasons. The classical interpretation of the motives behind this process as military and strategic activities (E.T. Salmon is the main representative of this line of thinking<sup>2</sup>) has recently been criticised by various researchers who have tried to point

<sup>1</sup> *SIG* II<sup>4</sup>, 543, 26; Livy XXVII, 10; App. *B.C.* I, 7; Toynbee 1965, I: 277–278; Salmon 1969, 51, 69; Sherwin-White 1973, 38–95; Ziolkowski 1994, 54–55; Bradley 2006, 161–162, 169–171; Laffi 2007, 13–88. Ancient writers suggest several definitions of a colony; see Livy VIII, 21; X, 217–211: *Nec qui nomina darent facile inveniebantur, quia in stationem se prope perpetuam infestae regionis, non in agros, mitti rebantur*; XXVII, 38, 5; Gell. *NA* 16.13, 8–9; Serv. *Ad Aen.* I, 12; Sic. Flacc. *De cond. agr.* 135, 20.

<sup>2</sup> Some ancient writers use military terminology in reference to colonies and colonists, e.g. Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2, 73 (*propugnacula imperii*); Livy XXVI, 36, 12; XXVII, 50, 6; XXXI, 49, 6; XXXIV, 56, 8; XXXVI, 2, 9; XXXVII, 47, 2; Asc. *In Pis.* 3 C; Sic. Flacc. *De cond. agr.* 135; Salmon 1969, 166, p. 9; Gargola 1995, 65–67; Pelgrom 2008, 333–335. Bispham (2006, 77–78), who – despite his criticism of some classical beliefs

out other aspects of the process. They often emphasise that other issues, including demographic and economic ones, should also be considered. Salmon himself did not reject them, either.<sup>3</sup> Salmon's classification of the colonies (*Priscae Coloniae Latinae, Coloniae Maritimae, Coloniae Latinae* and *Coloniae Civium Romanorum*), based mainly on the accounts of Livy, Velleius Paterculus and other Late Republic and Early Empire writers, has also sometimes been questioned.<sup>4</sup>

Identifying the reasons for Roman colonisation in the sources is not an easy matter, since we do not have access to a direct source that presents a planned and organised colonisation policy followed by the Republic. This raises the question of whether Rome could have had such a policy at all. On the one hand, it is not altogether possible to give a clear and positive answer to this question due to the source materials available to us. On the other hand, information on the founded colonies, appearing somewhat on the margins of accounts of military activities (war campaigns) and diplomatic missions in Italy (alliances and coalitions, so called *foedera*), but also connected with the internal policy conducted by Rome (grants of land) may indicate that colonisation complemented such activities. This complementary character of the process of colonisation in relation to other political, military, diplomatic, and internal activities seems to be an important feature of the Republic's activities.<sup>5</sup>

---

about colonisation – agrees with many of them, see Salmon 1969, 18–20; Gargola 1995, 58–64. Patterson (2006, 191, 194) emphasises that the officials founding colonies, the so-called *tresviri coloniae deducendae*, were meritorious Roman generals, usually consuls elected by the Assembly. The social structure of a Latin colony at Aquileia resembled a legion: there were the *equites*, *centuriones* and *pedites*: Livy XL, 34, 2. Aquileia sometimes used to be called the *claustrum Italiae*: Strabo 5.1.8.(214); Toynbee 1965, II: 150, 198, 284; Salmon 1969, 106; Bandelli 2003, 53–55, 59, 63. Previously, Ariminium used to be referred to by this term, see below.

<sup>3</sup> Salmon (1969, 112–113) emphasises a change in the motives behind founding colonies occurring from the mid-2<sup>nd</sup> century (the activity of the Gracchi brothers); Sherwin-White 1973, 9–10, 83–85. See Toynbee 1965, I: 179–189, 249–258; Ziolkowski 1994, 62–72; Oakley 2002, 19–22; Bispham 2006, 76–77; Bradley 2006, 169–171.

<sup>4</sup> Asc. Pis. 3 C proposes a different classification of colonies: *duo porro genera larum coloniarum quae a populo Romano deductae sunt fuerunt, ut Quiritium aliae, aliae Latinorum essent*. See Crawford 1995, 190: “La verità ché non abbiamo la minima idea di ciò che significasse il termine colonia populi Romani per il Romani della fina Repubblica”; Bispham 2006, 81–85. On the other hand, in the introduction to his *Roman Colonization under the Republic*, E.T. Salmon wrote: “In the great days of the Roman Republic, in the fourth, third and second centuries, the colonies sent out by the Romans were of two kinds. The one kind, the so-called Latin colonies (*coloniae Latinae*), were peopled by settlers who did not possess Roman citizenship; the other kind, the so-called citizen colonies (*coloniae Romanorum*), were peopled by settlers who did. Since both kinds of colonies were authorized and established by the Roman state, it may well be asked what determined the choice of one type rather than other on any given occasion” (1969, 15). See Salmon 1982, 63–67.

<sup>5</sup> Sherwin-White 1973, 76: “The Romans had another weapon in their armoury, the ‘colonia civium Romanorum’”; Ziolkowski 1994, 49–79; Patterson 2006, 191–192; Piegdoń 2009, 128–129, 241–242. The only source account that provides continuous information about the colonies, dates, and circumstances of setting up colonies by Republican Rome is *Historia Romana*, written by Velleius Paterculus, which does not include all the foundations (from the capture of Rome by the Gauls in 390 to the foundation of the colony of Eporedia, whose date is very controversial), see Vell. Pat. I, 14–15; Laffi 2007, 247–259 (sources on colonisation). The time of founding colonies in a seized territory differed. Sometimes colonies were built soon after military operations were completed (or even while they were still being conducted), and in other cases several decades passed between the time of capture by Rome and the colony being founded, see Ziolkowski 2004, 140. It seems that there are several possible reasons for this. It depended, firstly, on the attitude of

Considering the objectives of Roman expansion, one of which was to obtain land for the growing population of citizens and allies, who could count on being granted limited or full citizenship, colonies were a realisation of this crucial reason for Roman imperialism.<sup>6</sup> Colonies were one of the instruments, next to organised or spontaneous *adsignationes viritanae*, which enabled Rome to transfer the *ager publicus* to their citizens and allies. The granted public land was divided into plots called *centuria* (centuriation), which were then divided into smaller *sortes*, separated by boundaries called *limites*.<sup>7</sup>

We should note one more aspect of Roman activities resulting, among others, in the foundation of colonies: the increasingly common tendency of contemporary researchers to emphasise Rome's role in transforming the Italian environment. By founding colonies, as well as smaller settlements (*fora, conciliabula* etc.), and by building roads with infrastructure, Rome was pursuing a close and subordinated urbanised civilisation, based on strong urban centres in mostly rural and pastoral Italy.<sup>8</sup>

Assessing the reliability of our sources (mainly the works of ancient historians) in connection to the process of colonisation, we should also remember that most of them were created towards the end of the Republic and during the Empire, and only very few fragments from earlier periods refer to the moment of founding specific colonies. Most

---

the conquered native people to Roman activities; secondly, on whether the region required, due to external danger, being guarded by placing a strong *claustrum* to protect Roman interests there. Various aspects of the Republic's internal policy were also important, such as the distribution of forces in the assemblies and the Senate, the support of influential officials, and demographic issues, which decided whether there was a sufficient number of people that could be sent out to a founded colony at a given moment. See Patterson 2006, 199–201 and below.

<sup>6</sup> Livy III, 1, 5; Dion Halic. 9, 59, 2; (Antium); App. *BC* I, 7; Sherwin-White 1973, 81–82 (Antium); Ziolkowski 1994, 67–69; 2004, 144–147, 159–160; Patterson 2006, 194–196. Many academic works have been devoted to identifying the reasons behind Roman imperialism, see Badian 1967; Harris 1992; Ziolkowski 1994, 72–79; 2004, 164–174; Edmondson 1993, 156–192; Brunt 2001, 288–323; Oakley 2002, 9–37; Rich 2002, 38–68; Cornell 2002, 139–170; Eckstein 2007, 567–589; Morley 2010, 14–37; Burton 2012.

<sup>7</sup> References to centuriation come from ancient sources, e.g. *Liber gromaticorum*; Hyginus' *Gromatici veteres*; Siculus Flaccus' *De condicionibus agrorum*; Frontinus' *De controversiis agrorum* etc. On centuriation, see Salmon 1969, 20–24; Brunt 1971, 294–296; Gargola 1995, 25–50; Patterson 2006, 189–199; Pelgrom 2008, 361–367.

<sup>8</sup> This was the case only in the regions which had not been affected by the process of intensive urbanisation, such as southern Italy, where Greek colonists were present, and partly Campania, Etruria and Apulia. Frequently, native settlements were transformed by the process of Romanisation into centres whose appearance, institutions, and buildings resembled their Roman and Latin neighbours, see Livy XXXVI, 3, 4–6; Salmon 1969, 70–81; Sherwin-White 1973, 77; Dench 1995, 1997, 43–52; Lomas 2003, 64–78. According to Patterson (2006: 210), the situation was different towards the end of the Republic: "In the process, the figure of the colonist became more ambiguous still – an upstanding soldier on the one hand, a threat to civic order on the other. The process was culminated with the atrocities of the triumviral period and Augustus' eventual abolition of colonial settlement for veterans in favour of cash donatives. Thereafter, colonisation in Italy was largely seen as a means of responding to urban crisis, reversing demographic decline, and demonstrating imperial favour in generosity. The main impetus of colonial settlement was now transferred to the provinces, where the combination of Romanised lifestyles and hard-handed behaviour towards local populations continued to alienate and attract the peoples of the empire in equal measure." Other activities which were supposed to increase dependence included building roads connecting settlements, both those founded by the Romans and native ones, see Laurence 2011. The process of transforming the territories captured by the Republic, as illustrated by Cisalpine Gaul, is described by Purcell 1990, 7–29. See Sherwin-White 1973, 8–9, 94–95; Laurence 2003, 95–110; Pelgrom 2008, 333–334.

frequently, the majority of our sources provide information about the colony's situation and the contemporary attitude towards colonisation (from the Late Republic and the Empire). For this reason, modern researchers frequently and justly accuse earlier sources of being anachronistic and unreliable.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, epigraphic and numismatic sources are an important addition to the accounts of ancient historians, which enable us to learn about various aspects (economic, social, religious etc.) of the functioning of certain Roman and Latin colonies. However, they date from different periods of the colonies' existence and constitute only a small percentage of all the documents of this kind created in the settlements. Similarly, archaeological sources (which help us pay attention to important aspects, such as the size of a colony and the population inhabiting it, the date of its foundation, and common features such as the presence of a forum, temples, and public buildings) are auxiliary.<sup>10</sup> It is therefore difficult to look for some principles or a possible colonisation policy of the Republic on the basis of inscriptions, coins, and archaeological sources.

The process of Roman colonisation underwent changes, and it is difficult to imagine that the colonies founded during the Early Republic (or even monarchy) were created on the basis of the same model/template (if there ever was one) as the ones founded in the 1<sup>st</sup> century. Early Rome, from the point of view of its size, policy, social issues, territory etc. was a state that faced different challenges and problems from the ones encountered in the 2<sup>nd</sup>–1<sup>st</sup> centuries BC.<sup>11</sup> However, the city's development in the 5<sup>th</sup>–1<sup>st</sup> centuries, in terms of its political system, administration, and law, was conducive to the gradual emergence of certain models of behaviour. Rome used such models when implementing its policy, one of the main aims of which was to subordinate Italy. It seems that the process of colonisation could also have undergone such changes, which gradually led to the model we know from available sources being worked out.<sup>12</sup> Since various types of transformations occurring in the Republic had an influence on the process of colonisa-

<sup>9</sup> Bispham 2006, 73–75, 78–83; Patterson 2006, 195.

<sup>10</sup> Bispham (2006, 81–92) mainly based his theories on an analysis of inscriptions and archaeological material from some colonies and on criticism of writers from the times of the Late Republic and especially the Empire. He also (Bispham 2006, 92–122) discussed cults in selected colonies on the basis of inscriptions. See Patterson 2006, 190–191; Laffi 2007, 247–259; Pelgrom 2008, 333–335.

<sup>11</sup> Bradley (2006, 167–171) strongly emphasises aspects of internal policy (conflict between the Patricians and the Plebeians) influencing the process of colonisation in the period of Early Republic. During the Early and Mid-Republic, the main challenge faced by Rome and its colonies was to capture important and strategic points of support in subjugated but usually hostile territories, giving the Roman state control over them. The colonies were also to become a reservoir of lands for Roman citizens and allies, including later generations (also towards the end of the Republic). See Salmon 1969, 13–18; Ziolkowski 1994, 50–72; Ungern-Sternberg 2005, 312–332. During the last century, colonies were also important for Roman generals fighting civil wars against one another. For them, colonies were important as strategic points during war campaigns, but the most crucial aspect was the possibility of awarding land to veterans, which was what foundations were for, see Keppie 1983; Patterson 2006, 202–208.

<sup>12</sup> Sherwin-White 1973, 3–37, 83–95. See Gargola 1995, 51–70; Oakley 2002, 18–19; Bradley 2006, 167–169; Pelgrom 2008, 358–360. The case of Greek colonies during the Great Colonisation is similar; we reconstruct their origins on the basis of various sources: archaeological, literary, and (less commonly) epigraphic. The majority of literary sources are from much later than the beginnings of the foundations, and frequently known foundation models are simply applied to much earlier times, cf. Hall 2011, 101–125.

tion implemented by Rome, the question arises of whether there were any common elements of the whole process during the existence of the Republic.

First of all, colonies in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries BC were settlements created on Rome's initiative, and only the Republic decided if a colony would be founded, and whether it would be a Roman or Latin one. There are differences in comparison to the previous period of the 5<sup>th</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> centuries, when the decision to found a colony was also made by other Latin states (until Rome's war against the Latin League in 340–338 BC), sometimes together with Rome.<sup>13</sup> During the Early Republic, important and influential leaders of the Roman *gentes*, holding high military functions or offices, could also make decisions to found settlements for Roman citizens.<sup>14</sup>

After Rome's victorious war against the Latin League and the end of the rivalry between the Patricians and the Plebeians in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, only the Republic's institutions decided whether a colony would be founded.<sup>15</sup> The colonies created by Rome on conquered land, which became public land (*ager publicus*), can be divided into two categories: citizen colonies, i.e. those in which Roman citizens were settlers, and Latin colonies. The latter model was adopted by the Republic from the Latin League. Here, the settlers could be those who had the legal status of Latins; allies; Roman citizens after giving up their citizenship (*civitas optimo iure*) and accepting the Latin status;<sup>16</sup> and pacified native people (*incolae*), on whose lands such settlements were built.<sup>17</sup>

Citizen colonies, which the sources call *coloniae civium Romanorum* or *coloniae Quiritium*, were initially small settlements of three hundred people (with families?), which fell under the jurisdiction of Roman institutions and officials, but had their own magistrates and the Council of Decurions.<sup>18</sup> They were founded in the *ager publicus* in strategically important places, usually close to the coast, which led to the name *coloniae maritimae* mentioned in sources; their job was to prevent, or rather delay, any possible descent on the coast, which was regarded as a territory subordinate to Rome.<sup>19</sup> Colonists in such settlements were not recruited to Roman legions.<sup>20</sup> The creation of such posts may have been related to the fact that Rome had virtually no fleet to protect the coast,

<sup>13</sup> Salmon 1969, 40–54; Ziolkowski 2004, 121–124, 143–144; Bradley 2006, 171.

<sup>14</sup> Ziolkowski 2004, 108–111; Bradley 2006, 164–169. No doubt, in later times the interests of mighty and influential politicians could also decide whether a colony would be founded on a particular spot, or whether plots would be distributed among individual settlers, but all these decisions were made in the Senate or at an assembly. See below.

<sup>15</sup> Gargola 1995, 52–58.

<sup>16</sup> Ziolkowski 2004, 144–146.

<sup>17</sup> Generally Bradley 2006, 171–179. One example of the presence of native people (the Veneti, the Celts) was Aquileia: *CIL* V 8443; Livy XL, 34; Toynbee 1965, II: 146, 151; Salmon 1969, 101; Brunt 1971, 192; Bandelli 1988, 36–39, 42–46, 125–126; Pelgrom 2008, 354–358; Piegoń 2009, 147–148. See Asc. *Pis.* 3; Tacit. *Hist.* III, 34. Settlers and colonists were often sent out to the territories whose population had been exterminated or deported, but also in place of or close to native settlements or smaller citizen settlements such as *fora*.

<sup>18</sup> *ILS* 5317, 1–2 (*lex de pariete faciundo* lub *lex Puteolana*); *CIL* X 1130, 1134, 5581, 5590 (censors in colonies), 6231; Cic. *Leg. Agr.* II, 92–93, 96 (pontiffs and augurs). See Toynbee 1965, I: 187; Salmon 1969, 71–75; Sherwin-White 1973, 87–94.

<sup>19</sup> Salmon 1969, 78 (as illustrated by the colony of Sena Gallica).

<sup>20</sup> Livy XXVII, 38, 3; XXXVI, 3, 5; Salmon 1969, 81. Attempts to conscript colonists during the Second Punic War (207) led to the *coloniae maritimae* appealing to plebeian tribunes.

nor ports in subordinated or influenced territories. Rome did not stop founding colonies, despite the fact that after the First Punic War it had a strong fleet and did not have to base its activities solely on ships provided by mostly Greek allies in Italy (*socii navales*); it still did not have proper ports for its fleet along the whole coast in its possession. After the First Punic War ended, the Roman fleet was depleted, and it was not Rome's main power during its expansion outside Italy.<sup>21</sup> The *coloniae maritimae* continued to be founded as a very convenient element of the Roman presence in an area. Such colonies were often founded as first settlements in freshly conquered territories, preceded the creation of larger and stronger Latin colonies, and were the *avant-garde* of the Roman presence in an area.

The Republic's view on such small colonies/garrisons changed only after the Second Punic War (218–201) and the crisis that affected Rome's relations with Latin colonies and other allies during the war against Hannibal. Unable to bear the burden imposed in connection with the military operations in Italy, some Latin colonies refused to provide supplies and soldiers in 209. After the Second Punic War, Rome punished the "defiant" colonies. The Republic's rulers also began to change their colonisation policy. Their war experiences led the Roman aristocracy to interfere more in the internal matters of their allies and to increasingly use Roman citizens as colonists; for over two decades they were to be the most privileged group when founding new colonies.<sup>22</sup> Starting in the mid-190s BC, the Republic started to found *coloniae civium Romanorum* for larger groups of citizens (2,000–3,000) and the settlers were supposed to receive much larger land grants (from 5 to 10 *iugera*). These colonies were also set up in strategically important places, but not necessarily in the vicinity of sea coasts, and could, importantly, provide Rome with military reinforcements. They were founded on important migration and trade routes, close to passes, rivers, coasts etc., and frequently several were founded at the same time (similarly to Latin colonies).<sup>23</sup> Individual colonial settlement at the time, organised by the state, also favoured Roman citizens, who were granted much larger

<sup>21</sup> Salmon 1969, 74; Lazenby 2012, 22, 70–71. Certainly, piracy was a problem which could have driven Rome to build such settlements; piracy was present in Italy, committed by the Ligurians on the Ligurian Sea, but also locally by the Etruscans on the west coast of Italy, and by the Illyrians, who were also active on the east coast of Italy, on the Adriatic. *Socii navales*: Badian 1958, 28–30.

<sup>22</sup> On the refusal of Latin colonies to support the Republic in 209, see Livy XXVII, 9; Salmon 1969, 82–91; Toynbee 1965, II: 90–91, 115–116; Ziolkowski 2004, 198. The increased interference of the Republic in the allies' affairs is emphasised by many modern historians: Badian 1958, 145–153; Toynbee 1965, II: 106–142; Sherwin-White 1973, 128–129 *contra* Jehne 2009, 145–147, 150. On changes in the Roman system of founding colonies for Roman citizens, see Smith 1954, 18–20; Badian 1958, 139–152; Toynbee 1965, II: 145–154, 198–199; Salmon 1969, 98–104; Wiseman 1971, 14–15; Sherwin-White 1973, 76–95; Piegdoń 2009, 141–143.

<sup>23</sup> After the Second Punic War the first citizen colonies were built at Puteola, Salernum and Buxentum in 195: Livy XXXIV, 45, 5–6. In the Roman colony of Saturnia, colonists received as many as ten *iugera* of land: Livy XXXIX, 55. In the colonies of Mutina and Parma the grants of land were five *iugera* at Mutina and as many as eight at Parma: *CIL* XI 826; Plin. *NH* II, 240; III, 115; App. *BC* III, 73, 298–301; Front. *Strat.* III, 14, 3–4; Toynbee 1965, I: 396; II: 147; Ewins 1952, 62, 63; Salmon 1969, 24, 104–105; Piegdoń 2009, 145–146. This is illustrated by Mutina and Parma, which protected the important passes through the Apennines, Abetone and Cisa, as well as the Latin colony Bononia in the vicinity of the Futa Pass: Ewins 1952, 55; Salmon 1969, 103, 105–106; Toynbee 1965, I: 281 n. 4, 486, 487; II: 144, 272; Harris 1971, 156. Pisaurum and Potentia were also founded close to the coast.

plots than the Latins and other Roman allies. One example is the settlement operation in the *ager Ligustinus et Gallicus* in northern Italy, undertaken by Rome in 173.<sup>24</sup> At the same time, the Republic started to abandon the idea of Latin colonies, fewer and fewer of which were founded.

Latin colonies, as mentioned above, were added to the system of citizen colonies when Rome, after the victorious war against the Latin League (340–338), took over the Latins' colonies and adapted this model of founding new settlements to its own goals. Latin colonies continued to be set up by the Republic for more than 150 years and became an important element of the Roman domination over the conquered areas, as well as a key factor which enabled Rome to solve demographic and economic problems.

*Coloniae Latinae* were also located in strategically important places, and usually at least two were founded in various parts of Italy, not necessarily close to one another (Placentia and Cremona on the banks of the Po River were exceptions). By founding large Latin colonies, Rome also solved the problem of "hunger" for land, sending the excess of the population, both citizens and allies, to such settlements. Roman citizens in these colonies had to give up their Roman citizenship, since from the legal point of view *coloniae Latinae* were completely separate bodies.<sup>25</sup> However, in return for large grants of land, sometimes as many as about a dozen or several dozen hectares (Aquileia, Bononia, Lucca),<sup>26</sup> the citizens who could not afford to support themselves in their homeland preferred to give up their citizenship and set off to other, more attractive, although sometimes dangerous, places. These colonies allowed the Republic to create strategic posi-

<sup>24</sup> Livy XLII, 4: *cum agri Ligustini et Gallici quod captum erat aliquantum vacaret, senatus consultum factum, ut is ager viritim divideretur Decemviro in eam rem creavit... Diviserunt dena iugera in singulos, socii nimirum Latini terna*; Ewins 1952, 59, 60, 61, 63, 65–66; Tibiletti 1965, 30; Toynbee 1965, II: 135, 198, 204–206. The colonists joined the *tribus* Pollia; Ewins 1952, 57, 60, 66. See Piegdoń 2009, 154–156.

<sup>25</sup> Salmon 1969, 74. A Roman citizen had to give up his citizenship; he did not lose it automatically, see Cic. *Dom.* 30, 78; *Caec.* 33, 98; Mouritsen 1998, 87–99. The presence of mostly Roman citizens in Latin colonies is confirmed by a passage from Cicero's speech *Pro Caec.* 98: *in colonias Latinis saepe nostri cives profecti*. A Roman citizen could not hold the *civitas optimo iure* and another citizenship at the same time. In order to receive the citizenship of another state, he first had to give up the *civitas optimo iure*: Cic. *Balb.* 11, 28: *Duarum civitatum civis noster esse iure civili nemo potest*; 12, 29: *Nos non possumus et huius esse civitatis et cuiusvis praetera. Ceteris concessum est*; Toynbee 1965, I: 179; Salmon 1969, 73–74. This does not mean, however, that a person who received the *civitas optimo iure*, and was originally not from Rome, did not feel connected to their birthplace, as illustrated by another fragment of Cicero's speech (*De Leg.* II, 5: *Omnibus municipibus duas esse censeo patrias unam naturae alteram civitatis. Ut ille Cato cum esset Tusculi natus in populi Romani civitatem susceptus est, itaque cum ortu Tusculanus esset, civitate Romanus, habuit alteram loci patriam alteram iuris... Sed necesse est caritate eam praestare qua reipublicae nomen universae civitatis est, pro qua mori et cui nos totos dedere et in qua nostra omnia ponere et quasi consecrare debemus. Dulcis autem non multo secus est ea quae genuit quam illa quae exceptit*); Catull. 1: *unus Italarum*; Diod. Sic. XXXVII, 11; Gell. *NA* 11, 8, 1: *homo Romanus natus in Latio*; 17, 17, 1 (Q. Ennius); Badian 1958, 23–24. Sheidel (2006, 223) estimates that between 338 and 263 the Republic sent out 60,000–80,000 male settlers (excluding women and children), and between 200 and 177 another 40,000–65,000 settlers. On general information on Latin colonies, see Pelgrom 2008, 333–372.

<sup>26</sup> On grants of land in Bononia: Livy XXXVII, 57; Toynbee 1965, II: 234, 236–239; Salmon 1969, 23, 101; Brunt 1971, 191; Piegdoń 2009, 143. On the size of plots in Aquileia: Livy XL, 34, 2: *Tria milia peditum quinquagena iugera, centuriones centena, centena quadragena equites acceperunt*; Toynbee 1965, II: 236, 283; Pelgrom 2008, 343 n. 30; Piegdoń 2009, 147–148. On grants of land in Lucca: Livy XLI, 13: *Quinquagena et singula iugera et semisses agri in singulos dati sunt*; Salmon 1969, 104, 109, 187–188 n. 193; Toynbee 1965, II: 539–540; Brunt 1971, 193; Piegdoń 2009, 151–154.

tions, but also to people the conquered and hostile territories with its own citizens and allies. The aim of such settlements, whose community equalled that of a legion of the Roman army, was undoubtedly strategic. The settlements, similarly to the Roman *socii*, were also supposed to supply provisions and, most importantly, military reinforcements. The method of recruiting settlers for colonies, and the whole ritual of the settlers setting off under the command of the *tresviri coloniae deducendae*, who were former consuls and praetors, resembled the march of Roman troops off to war. The significance of these officials was not limited to the stage of founding the colony. Later, as patrons of the colony, they would intervene in Rome and arbitrate if there was a conflict of colonial settlers with the inhabitants of other colonies or native settlements.<sup>27</sup> Giving a lot of autonomy (their own offices, councils, bronze coins, military forces) to such colonies and their economic self-sufficiency meant that they did not pose a great burden to Rome but brought certain benefits.<sup>28</sup> Since many colonists had previously been Roman citizens, who had families, relatives, patrons, interests and various other affairs in Rome, the Republic allowed Latin colonists to marry Roman citizens (*ius conubium*), conduct legal business affairs with citizens in the city (*ius commercium*), participate in plebeian assemblies and vote (*ius suffragium*) and, with time, permitted colonial officials to receive full Roman citizenship (*ius civitatis per magistratum adipiscendae*).<sup>29</sup> Apart from this, settlers from the *coloniae Latinae* were granted some legal rights regarding inheritance from Roman

<sup>27</sup> The Latins supported the Republic with military reinforcements, as their presence in the *formula togatorum* is reported by Polybius (II, 24) and *FIRA* I<sup>2</sup> 8, 21, 50: *sociumque nominisque Latinis quibus ex formula togatorum milites in terra Italia imperare solet* [vide]; Sherwin-White 1973, 158 n. 2; Bispham 2007, 94. The practice of settling whole legions is also known from later accounts from the period of the Late Republic and Early Empire: Tacit. *Ann.* XIV, 27, 3; Hyg. 176, 11; Brunt 1971, 294–295. See Gargola 1995, 67–70; Pelgrom 2008, 337–354 (discussion on the actual size of the population in Latin colonies and critique of sources in connection to the number of colonists).

<sup>28</sup> On the financial support of Rome, see Livy XXVII, 9; XXIX, 15. Rome's biggest expense was most likely the foundation of a colony, which required certain funds for construction work and for providing for the colonists, who needed help to make a living in the initial period of their presence in a sometimes hostile and foreign territory. Another possible expense the state had to cover in a colony emerged if the colony was destroyed or considerably weakened by hostilities. In such circumstances, the Republic's interference was also necessary; its officials had to recruit new colonists (*supplementum*) and to provide financial support for the rebuilding of the colony. See below. On the role of the *tresviri coloniae deducendae* as arbiters, see Calderazzo 1997, 25–46.

<sup>29</sup> The Latin status (*Latinitas*) changed and transformed with regard to rights and duties during its existence in the times of the Republic and later: Gaius *Inst.* I, 96 (*Maius Latium* and *Minus Latium*). On the laws, see Cic. *Att.* I, 1, 2; Asc. *Pis.* 3 C: *...id est ut petendo magistratus civitatem Romanam adipiscerentur*; Livy VIII, 14, 10: *conubia commerciaque et concilia inter se*; IX, 43, 23: *tribus populi... suae leges redditae conubiumque inter ipsos permissum*; XXIII, 22; XXV, 3, 16: *sitella lata est ut sortirentur ubi Latini suffragium ferrent*; XXXIV, 42, 5; Tac. *Hist.* III, 34: *adnexu conubiisque gentium adolevit floruitque* (this concerns Cremona, but it is difficult to say whether it referred to *conubium* between Roman citizens and Latin colonists, or *conubium* between native people and the colonists from Cremona, which is more likely); Caius *Inst.* I, 56, 57, 67, 79–80 (the Latins holding the *ius conubium*); Ulpian *Tituli* 5, 4; 9 (*ius conubium*); 19, 4 (*ius commercium*); Smith 1954, 20; Badian 1958, 20–24; Taylor 1960, 109; Toynbee 1965, I: 249–258; Salmon 1969, 51–69; Sherwin-White 1973, 96–118; Luraschi 1979, 160, 165, 168–173, 221–299, 301–329, 336–342; Gargola 1995, 51–70; Bispham 2007, 74–76. The “Latins” probably lost the right guaranteeing them the possibility of receiving the *civitas optimo iure per migrationem et censum* in the 2<sup>nd</sup>–1<sup>st</sup> century, perhaps on the basis of the *lex Iunia* of 122 or the *Licinia Mucia* of 95(?): Asc. *Pis.* 67; Sherwin-White 1973, 110–111; Luraschi 1979, 236–238. See Piegoń 2009, 190–191.



citizens (these are probably the privileges referred to by the terms *ius Ariminiensis* or *ius duodecim coloniae*, which appear in sources with reference to Latin colonies).<sup>30</sup>

The model of Latin colonies worked well as an instrument of domination in Italy during the Roman conquest of the Apennine Peninsula in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries BC and during the First Punic War. However, the complications during the Second Punic War put a question mark over the trust in Latin colonies as well as allies in general. Numerous *socii* going over to Hannibal's side, as well as the refusal to supply Rome with provisions and military reinforcements by twelve Latin colonies exhausted by war, forced the Republic to re-think its colonisation policy in the early 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC. Its new main aim was mainly the creation of the *coloniae civium Romanorum* for Roman citizens, who, following the example of Latin colonies, were given much bigger plots of land, while the settlers were more numerous compared to the *coloniae maritimae*. Even so, setting up Latin colonies was not completely abandoned in Italy in the first two decades of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century (two at Bruttium as well as Bononia, Aquileia, Graviscae and Lucca), and there were no attempts to change the status of the existing *coloniae Latinae*; on the contrary, they were strengthened after the chaos of the Second Punic War by sending in new settlers (*supplementum*) and rebuilding many of them from ruins.<sup>31</sup> From the mid-170s, no more Latin colonies were founded, and the frequency of creating new *coloniae civium Romanorum* was also smaller than before. The Latin legal status (*Latinitas*) was used by Rome in relations with the native people in Italy, who could be given such status, as illustrated by the *lex Pompeia de Transpadanis* of 89, which granted the *Latinitas* to over twenty native settlements in northern Italy loyal to Rome during the *bellum sociale*.<sup>32</sup>

Without doubt, colonisation was one of the tools of the Roman policy of domination in Italy in the 4<sup>th</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> centuries BC; the Republic also used the instrument when conducting political and military operations against the inhabitants of Picenum and the *ager*

<sup>30</sup> This rather ambiguous type of status is only known from a reference in Cicero's speech *Pro Caecina* (35, 102), which read as follows: *...Sulla ipse ita tulit de civitate, ut non sustulerit horum nexa atque hereditates. Iubet enim eodem iure esse, quo fuerint Ariminenses; quos quis ignorat duodecim coloniarum fuisse et a civibus Romanis hereditates capere posse?*; Badian 1958, 24–25; Krawczuk 1960, 33–44; Toynbee 1965, I: 253–256; II: 533; Salmon 1969, 92–94, 106–108; Sherwin-White 1973, 102–104; Luraschi 1979, 225–299; Bispham 2006, 89. Perhaps it meant granting Latin colonists the right to inherit from Roman citizens, as suggested by the sources, see Cic. *Caec.* 98; Caius *Inst.* II, 101–102. See Luraschi 1979, 281–293; Piegdóń 2009, 191 n. 603.

<sup>31</sup> Aquileia: *CIL* I, 2, 621 = V 873; Livy XXXIX, 22, 54–55; XL, 34, 53; Piso *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae* frg. 35, Peter; Vell. Pat. I, 15; Strabo 5, 1, 8 (C 214); Plin. *NH* III, 126; Herodian VIII, 2; Ewins 1952, 56, 59; Toynbee 1965, II: 629; Salmon 1969, 106–107; Piegdóń 2009, 146–149. Lucca and Luna: Livy XLI, 13; XLV, 13; Vell. Pat. I, 15; Strabo 5, 1, 11 (C 217); Plin. *NH* III, 50. The matter of dating the foundations at Luna and Lucca is a very complicated historiographical problem: Toynbee 1965, II: 540, 655; Brunt 1971, 168, 192–193; Harris 1971, 149; Sherwin-White 1973, 78–79; Piegdóń 2009, 149–154. *Supplementum*: Livy XXXVII, 46, 9–11 (Placentia and Cremona); Ewins 1952, 57; Toynbee 1965, II: 144, 272; Salmon 1969, 101; Brunt 1971, 191; Luraschi 1979, 79–80; Piegdóń 2009, 140–141 and Livy XLIII, 17, 1 (Aquileia); Toynbee 1965, II: 57; Salmon 1969, 108; Piegdóń 2009, 149.

<sup>32</sup> Cic. *Att.* 1, 1, 2; Asc. *Pis.* 3; Strabo 5, 1, 1 (C 209); Plin. *NH* III, 138; Tac. *Ann.* XI, 23–24; Sherwin-White 1973, 158–159; Luraschi 1979, 144–145; Piegdóń 2009, 196–198.

*Gallicus* on the central Adriatic coast, which later belonged to Region V (present-day Marecchia) and Region VIII (Emilia).<sup>33</sup>

The Italian Adriatic coast played a very important role in Rome's policy. This strip of coast, inhabited by a mosaic of peoples, with big and strong Greek cities in the south, led by Tarent, was an appealing prospect for expansive Rome in the 4<sup>th</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> century, and the Republic fought over it not just with the native people but also with Greek rulers, led by King Pyrrhus, who was interfering mainly on behalf of Greek *poleis*.<sup>34</sup>

Picenum, located on the Adriatic coast, inhabited by the tribes of Piceni, Picentines, and Praetutii (southern part of Picenum), with strong settlements such as Ausculum, and important cult centres such as Cupra and the Greek *polis* Ancona,<sup>35</sup> found itself within the sphere of the Republic's interest as early as the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> century. In the course of their military operations against the Etruscan Lucumoni and the Celts from Cisalpine Gaul, who, together with the Samnites, built a strong coalition against the Roman expansion (the Third Samnite War), the Romans also came into contact with the inhabitants of these territories.<sup>36</sup> For the inhabitants of the rich and fertile territories on the Adriatic coast the appearance of the legions was an important event, since these lands were frequently attacked by their Celtic neighbours from the north, the Senones, who had earlier (in the 4<sup>th</sup> century) captured some of their lands and settled there, posing a serious threat.<sup>37</sup> It seems that the difficult war situation forced both sides, i.e. the inhabitants of

<sup>33</sup> Polyb. II, 21, 7; Strabo 5, 2, 10 (C 227); 5, 4, 2 (C 241); Plin. *NH* III, 38–39; 109–111; VI, 218; Pomp. Mela *De chor.* II, 59; II, 65; Ptol. III, 1, 52; SHA *Gord.* IV, 6; *Liber coloniarum* II, 225–228 Lachmann; Thomsen 1947, 109–120; Antonelli 2003, 45–62; Riva 2007, 79–89. There are quite a number controversies concerning the border between northern Picenum, inhabited by the tribes of Picentines and Picenes and southern Picenum, inhabited by the Praetutii, see Thomsen 1947, 109–112. Determining the precise territory of the Senones in northern Picenum is also problematic, see Thomsen 1947, 112–116.

<sup>34</sup> Càssola 1972, 43–63; Bandelli 1985, 59–83.

<sup>35</sup> Cato *frg.* 43 Peter; Strabo 5, 2, 10 (C 227); 5, 3, 1; 5, 4, 2 (C 241); 5, 4, 13 (C 251); Plin. *NH* III 38–39; 70; 109–111; 139; VI, 218; Pomp. Mela *De chor.* II, 59; 65; 69; Ptol. I, 7; 69; III, 1, 52; Pseudo-Scylax 15; Avien. *or. mar.* 496–500; Silius Italicus *Punica* VIII, 424–445, 573–581; Eutrop. II, 8; SHA *Gord.* IV, 6; Steph. Byz. *s.v.* 'Ατρία; Speranza 1900; Percosi Serenelli 1990, 155–188; Naso 2002, 11–233. On literary sources on Picenum, see Thomsen 1947, 50–51; Fieconi 1996, 28–50; Naso 2002, 234–250; Antonelli 2003, 13–78; Luni 2004, 44–45; Riva 2008, 79–114; Sonocchia 2008, 49–76. The significance of Ausculum as the most important city in the region is emphasised by sources: Flor. I, 14; Fest. 235 Lachmann; Laffi/Pasquinnucci/Gabba 1975, 11–56. Ancona, as a Greek colony, was founded by the ruler of Syracuse, Dionysius I the Elder: Naso 2002, 255–259; Braccisi 2007, 19–30. The Greek presence in the region was not restricted to Ancona, and Greek influences in the region had started in archaic times: Luni 2004, 51–54, 57–69; Braccisi 2007, 121–148. We should also mention such cities as Spina and Adria, which also had a strong Greek element. The significance of the cult centre at Cupra for the inhabitants of the region has been emphasised by: Mostardi 1977, 17–25, 39–73; Naso 2002, 234–250. These territories also experienced Etruscan, Illyrian (across the Adriatic), and strong Celtic influences: Toynbee 1965, I: 95–99; Colonna 1984, 95–105; Naso 2002; Luni 2004, 51–56; Riva 2007, 79–114.

<sup>36</sup> On the Third Samnite War, see Salmon 1967, 255–279; Harris 1971, 61–78; Ziolkowski 1994, 58–59; Oakley 2002, 11–12. Such a large coalition against Rome was unprecedented in the history of Roman expansion in Italy. On the Etruscan-Celtic cooperation in 299, see Polyb. II, 19, 1–4; Livy X, 10, 1. Some Umbrian settlements also joined the war, but their weak involvement, as well as the meagre help provided by the Etruscans to the Celtic-Samnite coalition, did not have much influence on the course of the war.

<sup>37</sup> Polyb. II, 17; 21, 7; App. *Gall.* 12; *Samn.* 6; Peyre 1979, 101; Fieconi 1996, 25–27; Kruta/Manfredi 1999, 136–143; Paci 2002, 86–93.

Picenum and the Roman Republic, to sign a treaty (*foedus*), perhaps in 299.<sup>38</sup> Rome must have been perceived by the Piceni as the lesser and more distant threat than the warlike Senones and their allies the Samnites.

Having expanded their rule along the River Tiber, the Romans had been present in the territories neighbouring Picenum from the east – Umbria to be precise – for well over a decade, and the Roman allies included the Umbrian settlements of Camerinum, Oriculum (*foedus aequum*), and perhaps also Ravenna, located north of Picenum on the Adriatic coast. The Roman influence was also strengthened by the foundation of the Latin colony of Narnia on the bank of the River Nar in 299, which replaced the destroyed Umbrian settlement of Nequinum.<sup>39</sup>

Some of the tribes from Picenum participated actively in the battles during the Third Samnite War.<sup>40</sup> They mainly included the Senones from northern Picenum (later *ager Gallicus*) and the Praetutii from southern Picenum. However, the main war effort was sustained by the Romans on one side, and the Samnites and the Senones on the other. Undoubtedly, the Republic's alliance with the wealthy and numerous inhabitants of Picenum brought them many benefits: an ally who could provide military contingents<sup>41</sup> and whose lands separated Rome's enemies – the Samnites and the Senones – as well as access to the Adriatic Sea. If we consider the Roman efforts in Umbria too, also aimed at preventing dangerous coalitions between the Celts and the Samnites, it is clear that in order to conduct its policy of domination in Italy, the Republic used a range of instru-

<sup>38</sup> Livy X, 10, 12; Laffi/Pasquonucci/Gabba 1975, 15; Delplace 1993, 3–4; Luni 2004, 69–70. It is difficult to say what the character of Rome's alliance (*foedus*) with the inhabitants of Picenum was, since Livy's reference to this event is very brief. Badian (1958, 27) believes that the character of this alliance could have been similar to the treaties of Camerinum and Oriculum, as it was signed when the Republic was facing a difficult moment during the Samnite War.

<sup>39</sup> On the treaties with Umbrian settlements, see *CIL* XI 5631 = *ILS* 432: *Imp. Caesari L. Septimio Severo... caelesti eius indulgentia in aeternam securitatem adque gloriam iure aequo foederis sibi confirmato Camertes p.p.*; Cic. *Balb.* 46: *cum Camertinum foedus dominium foederum sanctissimum atque aequissimum sciret esse*; 48: *Neque Iguvinatum neque Camertium foedere esse exceptum, quominus eorum civibus a populo Romano praemia virtutis tribuerentur*; Livy IX, 36, 1–14; 41, 20; Diod. XX, 35, 1–5; 44, 8–9; Pietrangeli 1943, 28; Badian 1958, 27; Toynbee 1965, I: 260, 263; Harris 1971, 99; Sherwin-White 1973, 121; Cornell 1995, 355–357; Bradley 2000, 107–109, 118–121; Burton 2012, 88–90, 191–192. Possibly, the *foedus* with Ameria and Iguvinum was the same. On the foundation of Narnia: Livy X, 10: *contra Umbros*; Plin. *NH* III, 113: *quod oppidum Nequinum antea vocitatum est*; Salmon 1969, 60, 63, 119; Harris 1971, 61, 68; Bradley 2000, 111–115. Staveley (1994, 421–422) claims that it was the foundation of colonies in the 4<sup>th</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> century, including Narnia, that cut off communication between the Samnites and the allies from the north, see Toynbee 1965, I: 154–155; Bandelli 2002b, 24. Not all Umbrian tribes were allied with Rome; some of them joined the war against Rome with the coalition of the Samnites, Senones and Etruscans.

<sup>40</sup> Livy X, 11, 7–8; Bandelli 2002b, 23–24; 2008, 338; Luni 2004, 71–73. According to Livy, during the early stage of the war they informed Rome about the Samnite preparations for war and about the attempts to force the Picentes to leave the alliance with the Republic. Perhaps some of these attempts at a Samnite-Celtic coalition were successful, because Livy reports that the Praetutii were punished after the war with the confiscation of some of their lands, where the citizen colony of Castrum (Novum) and a Latin colony of Hadria/Hatria were built, and the inhabitants were given the status of *civitas sine suffragium*: Livy *Per.* 11, 8; Front. *De contr. p.* pp. 18–19 Lachmann; Laffi/Pasquonucci/Gabba 1975, 16; Bandelli 2008, 340–341.

<sup>41</sup> Perhaps the allies from Picenum fought on the Roman side in the battle of Ausculum against the King of Epirus, Pyrrhus, see Dion. Hal. XX 1 4–5; Bandelli 2008, 344–345.

ments, including a system of alliances (settlements in Umbria and Picenum), colonisation (Narnia) and using legions, even in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries.<sup>42</sup>

During the Third Samnite War, Rome was forced to fight on several fronts at once; although it was not a new phenomenon, this time the opponents did not fight separately, but formed a coalition conducting coordinated operations. The Republic had put a lot of effort into preventing its opponents from joining forces. The coalition consisted mainly of the Samnites and the Celtic Senones, as well as the Etruscans and the Umbrians, drawn into the conflict by the genius of the Samnite general Gellius Egnatius. The Samnite forces, despite a Roman buffer, managed to make their way north, where they conducted sabotage actions to embolden the other confederates to act against Rome and its allies. However, in the 4<sup>th</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> centuries Rome's ability to mobilise an army was strong enough for the Romans not only to throw their main forces, i.e. the consular army, against the coalition of the Samnites and the Senones, but also to conduct a simultaneous operation against the Etruscans and the Umbrians.<sup>43</sup> A large part of the military operations occurred in the territory of Picenum's neighbours, Umbria and Etruria. The confederates even managed to defeat the consular army at Camerinum/Clusium in 296,<sup>44</sup> but the turning point of the war was the battle fought on the Umbrian fields at Sentinum in 295. The Samnite-Senonian forces were routed and the armies of their Etruscan and Umbrian allies were stopped by the sabotage actions of the Roman forces, which prevented them from joining up with the Samnites and the Senones. The Romans subjugated the territories of Etruria and Umbria within years of the victory at Sentinum.<sup>45</sup> The war against the Samnites continued until 290, but they were alone in their fight, since neither Celtic warriors nor Etruscans and Umbrians were able to engage in military activities.<sup>46</sup> When the war against the Samnites was over, the consul M'. Curius Dentatus subjugated the lands of the Umbrian Sabines in 290,<sup>47</sup> and some territories in northern Picenum were

<sup>42</sup> The lands of the allied Picentes were a buffer zone, which could stop Celtic invasions from Cisalpine Gaul, see Staveley 1994, 425. According to Pliny the Elder, the populous territories of Region V (i.e. roughly the lands belonging to the Picentes) provided Rome with considerable military contingents (*NH* III 110: *Quinto regio Piceni est, quondam uberrimae multitudinis: CCCLX Picentium in fidem p. R. venere*). See Strabo 5, 4, 2 (C 241–42); Dion. Hal. XX, 1, 4–5; Bandelli 2008, 338–339, 344–345.

<sup>43</sup> On the Republic's demographic and recruitment capacity during the Third Samnite War, see Livy X, 27, 10–11; *Per.* 11; Oakley 2002, 29; Suder 2003, 112–130; Ziolkowski 2004, 152–156, 161. On the Battle of Sentinum, see Salmon 1967, 265–270; Paci 2002, 81–93; Bandelli 2002a, 63–79. The significance of this clash has been emphasised by numerous modern theses and papers, e.g. a collection of articles published on the 2,300<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the battle, titled *Sentinum 295 a.C. Sassoferato 2006. 2300 anni dopo la battaglia. Una città romana tra storia e archeologia. Convegno internazionale Sassoferato 21–23 Settembre 2006* a cura di Maura Medri.

<sup>44</sup> Polyb. II, 19, 5 (Camerinum); Livy X, 25, 11; 27, 4 (Clusium); Salmon 1967, 266–268; Harris 1971, 69–70; Bradley 2000, 115–116. There are numerous controversies regarding the place of the battle of the coalition against the Romans in 296.

<sup>45</sup> On the Roman sabotage actions against the Etruscans and the Umbrians, see Livy X, 31; 34; 37; *Per.* 11 (Volsinii); Diod. XX, 35, 4–5; Salmon 1967, 268–269; Harris 1971, 74–78; Pallottino 1991, 129, 136; Bradley 2000, 116.

<sup>46</sup> Salmon 1967, 268–279.

<sup>47</sup> Livy XXVIII, 45; *Per.* 11; Vell. Pat. I, 14; Flor. I, 10; Harris 1971, 84; Pallottino 1991, 103; Bradley 2000, 116–117; Bandelli 2008, 340–341. On the division of the Sabines' lands, see Strabo 5, 3, 1 (C 228); Vell. Pat. I, 14; Plin. *NH* XVIII, 3, 18; Val. Max. IV, 3, 5; Front. *Strat.* IV, 3, 12; Toynbee 1965, I: 104, 377–387; II: 142; Ziolkowski 1994, 62, 63, 66.

captured; they had belonged to the Senones (*ager Gallicus*), who had taken them away from the native tribe.<sup>48</sup>

The military operations also affected the territories of southern Picenum, since some of the tribes (Praetutii) abandoned the alliance with the Republic and went over to the coalition's side.<sup>49</sup> Consequently, the Romans forced them into submission and captured some of their lands, on which two colonies were founded: the *coloniae civium Romanorum* of Castrum (Novum) and the Latin colony of Hadria, alias Hatria. We cannot say much about these foundations on the basis of written sources. Even the date and place of the foundation of Castrum (Novum) are not certain, because the accounts of Livy and Velleius Paterculus differ considerably. Livy states that the colony was founded in the same year as the colonies at Hadria/Hatria and Sena (Gallica), i.e. 290, and Velleius Paterculus claims that Castrum was built in 264, on the eve of the First Punic War, together with the Latin colony at Firmum. The place of the foundation is problematic since some historians, following the account of Velleius Paterculus, believe that Castrum (Novum) was founded in Etruria and corresponds with present-day Santa Marinella, while others, believing Livy's account to be more reliable, think that it was in Picenum, on the territory belonging to the Praetutii (present-day Giulianova).<sup>50</sup>

There are also serious doubts about the name of the Latin colony of Hadria or Hatria. It is mentioned in written sources as Hadria, but the abbreviation *HAT* appears on the legends of bronze coins (*aes grave*) minted in this colony. We are able to determine the status of this settlement on the basis of the facts that it minted its coins and had magisterial offices typical of Latin colonies, which can be recognised in epigraphic sources.<sup>51</sup>

The presence of the warlike Celts was not conducive to individual colonial settlement in the *ager Gallicus*, as the lives of unprotected settlers would be in danger. Rome, not wanting to endanger its citizens and allies, and wary of provoking the aggressive Cisalpine Celts (especially since it was on the eve of a war in the south against Tarent and its ally, the king of Epirus, Pyrrhus), restricted itself to selecting a small territory and allocating it to a civil colony of Sena Gallica. It was probably founded between 290/289 and 283.<sup>52</sup> Its garrison of three hundred men with their families was, naturally, incapable

<sup>48</sup> Delplace 1993, 25. It is difficult to say whether the Senones' lands in Picenum were captured by Rome right after the Third Samnite War or only in 283. See below.

<sup>49</sup> See above note 42.

<sup>50</sup> Livy, *Per.* 11, 6: *Coloniae deductae sunt Castrum, Sena, Hadria*; Vell. Pat. I, 14; Salmon 1969, 78–79, 119–120; Delplace 1993, 4; Bandelli 2002b, 27–30.

<sup>51</sup> *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 40 = *ILLRP* 77 (consuls); *CIL* I<sup>2</sup>, 2129a = *ILLRP* 545; *CIL* I<sup>2</sup>, 2129b = *ILLRP* 545 (duoviri); Livy, *Per.* 11, 6: *Hadria*; XXVII, 10, 7: *Hadriani*; Salmon 1969, 62; Bandelli 2002b, 32–34; 2008, 350–351; Pelgrom 2008, 352 n. 30 (the colony's area is estimated at 30 ha). The colonists joined the tribus Maecia: *CIL* IX 5019 = *ILS* 5427 = *ILLRP* 304; Petracchia Lucernoni 1988, 186–187. On the repercussions of the events of 209 see above. The status of the Latin colony of Firmum can be determined in a similar way; see below.

<sup>52</sup> Polyb. II, 19, 12; Livy, *Per.* 11; XXVII, 38, 4: *ab supero mari Senensis*; Salmon 1969, 62, 78, 81; Càssola 1972, 43; Paci 2002, 82–83; Luni 2004, 73–74. The problem of dating the foundation of the colony at Sena Gallica results from confusion in the written sources. The Livy tradition cites the year 289, while Polybius seems to opt for the year 283: Toynbee 1965, I: 87, 149–150 n. 8, 154 n. 6, 155, 167; Salmon 1969, 176 n. 82, 180 n. 119; Harris 1971, 79–84; Paci 2002, 82–85. See Brunt 1971, 167; Bandelli 1988, 5, 8; 1999, 193; 2002a, 72, 74; Ziolkowski 1994, 62; Paci 2002, 92–93. The citizens settled at Sena were to belong to the tribus Pollia: Bandelli 1985, 59–83; 1988, 6; 2002a, 77 *contra* Harris 1971, 334, 339. On the discussion about

of stopping any serious act of aggression of the Celtic tribes from Cisalpine Gaul<sup>53</sup>. The colony of Sena Gallica, situated near the Adriatic coast, almost at the mouth of the River Sena, was supposed to be an outpost that would repel possible attacks of Illyrian pirates on the coast or pillaging attacks of small Celtic groups. Its importance was not just strategic – it was a modest but clear symbol of the Roman presence on the territories between the Rivers Aesis and Utens and on the Adriatic coast.

The breakdown of the coalition and the defeat of its members did not bring peace and quiet for the Republic. The factor which destabilised the situation in the region was the Cisalpine Celts. They interfered in the Italian matters on many occasions and posed a serious threat not only to their closest neighbours but also to tribes in central Italy and to the Roman imperial policy (*metus/tumultus Gallicus*).<sup>54</sup> In the 280s the Celtic tribes attacked several times, mainly in Etruria, spreading fear and fire among the Roman allies. The Republic tried to stop these Celtic attacks by sending legions and by building, through a system of alliances, a buffer zone to separate Roman lands from Celtic territories.<sup>55</sup>

In 284 at Arretium, the Senones inflicted a heavy defeat on the Roman legions, in which the consul L. Cecilius Metellus Denter was killed. Rome's response was almost immediate. In 283, legions under the command of the consul M'. Curius Dentatus completely sacked the territory inhabited by the Senones, and murdered or sold into slavery the majority of the people, so that only a handful managed to stay on their old lands. On the captured Senonian territory in Picenum, between the Rivers Utens in the north and Aesis in the south, the *ager Gallicus* was created, which remained undivided until 268, when the Latin colony of Ariminum was founded. The *ager Gallicus* was not divided immediately due to Rome's size – it did not have enough citizens and allies to people such a large area.<sup>56</sup>

However, exterminating the Senones did not put a stop to Gallic raids. In 283, the Senones' neighbours from the north, the Boii, invaded Etruria; after joining the Etruscan forces, they marched towards Rome. However, the Etruscans were routed, and the few Boii left alive withdrew after the defeat. The Boii made another attempt to attack the Roman territory, but they were defeated again and forced to sign a truce with Rome that held for over forty years,<sup>57</sup> which likely facilitated the Roman conquest of southern Italy.

---

the distribution of the settlers from Picenum in the tribes Velina and Quirinia, and from the *ager Gallicus* in the *tribus* Pollia, see Taylor 1960, 60–63; Toynbee 1965, I: 176–178, 225, 377–387.

<sup>53</sup> *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 40 = *ILLRP* 77 (consuls); 2129a = *ILLRP* 545; 2129b = *ILLRP* 545 (duoviri); Liv. *Per.* 11 6: *Hadria*; XXVII 10 7: *Hadriani*; Salmon 1969, 62; Bandelli 2002b, 32–34; 2008, 350–351; Pelgrom 2008, 352 n. 30 (the colony's area is estimated at 30 ha). The colonists joined the *tribus* Maecia: *CIL* IX 5019 = *ILS* 5427 = *ILLRP* 304; Petracchia Lucernoni 1988, 186–187. The status of the Latin colony of Firmum can be determined in a similar way, see below.

<sup>54</sup> On the *tumultus italicus gallicusque* in the Roman policy, see Polyb. II, 22; Cic. *Philipp.* VIII, 2–3; Plut. *Marcell.* 3; Plin. *NH* III, 138; Gabba 1989, 207–208; Vishnia 1996, 22–23; Piegdoń 2009, 79–81.

<sup>55</sup> On the chronology of Celtic invasions, see Polyb. II, 19–20; Dion. Halic. 19, 13; Livy, *Per.* 12; App. *Gall.* 11; *Samn.* 6; Flor. I, 8; Eutrop. II, 10; Oros. III, 22; Corbett 1971, 656–664; Harris 1971, 79–84; Peyre 1979, 43–46; Dyson 1985, 24–27.

<sup>56</sup> Salmon 1969, 78; Ziolkowski 1994, 68–69; 2004, 160.

<sup>57</sup> Piegdoń 2009, 79–81.

The Republic was not only free to expand in the south of Italy, but was also able to secure its northern Italian border.<sup>58</sup>

Truce agreements with the Celtic tribes from Cisalpine Gaul and settlement and colonisation actions conducted by the Republic in the subordinated territories of Umbria, Etruria, and Picenum allowed the Romans to build a solid barrier protecting the territories of Roman Italy from Celtic interference from the north. After the war against the King of Epirus, Pyrrhus, and his allies from southern Italy, Rome began to move against the remaining independent tribes and settlements in Picenum and Umbria, whose lands separated Roman possessions. In the years 268–265, the Republic dealt with the northernmost and independent Umbrian tribes.<sup>59</sup> Earlier, perhaps already in 269, the independent inhabitants of Picenum had been dealt with. Sources inform us about the military campaigns of the Roman consuls, Q. Ogulnius and G. Fabius Pictor in 269 and P. Sempronius Sophus (Tib. Sempronius Gracchus?) and App. Claudius Russus in 268, who subjugated the inhabitants of Picenum.<sup>60</sup> Some of the defeated were deported south to Samnium, where they were settled near the Latin colony of Paestum (former Greek Poseidonia). The rest were given limited Roman citizenship (*civitas sine suffragium*), apart from Ausculum and perhaps the former Greek colony of Ancona, which maintained the previous alliance (*foedus*). In place of the displaced native people and the exterminated Senones, Rome founded (before the outbreak of the First Punic War) the Latin colonies of Ariminum in the *ager Gallicus* (near the Adriatic coast) in 268 and Firmum (present-day Fermo) almost in the middle of the old area of free Picenum in 264.<sup>61</sup>

In the northern part of the lands taken from the Senones, i.e. close to the territories of the Celtic tribes from Cisalpine Gaul, the large Latin colony of Ariminum was founded in 268 on the banks of the Rivers Arimnus (Marecchia) and Aprusa Crustumium (Ausa Conca).<sup>62</sup> The rulers of the Republic decided to found a Latin colony with special rights on the basis of the *ius Ariminensium* or *ius XII coloniarum*. Unlike small Sena, which had been built earlier, this colony was to withstand more effectively possible Celtic attempts at interfering south of their lands, towards the Adriatic coast, and in the newly conquered territories in Picenum (*ager Picenus*) in the vicinity of the Apennines.<sup>63</sup> It seems that the Roman initiative could have been related to plans for a new war in the

<sup>58</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>59</sup> Livy, *Per.* 15; Harris 1971, 84; Staveley 1994, 425; Bradley 2000, 117.

<sup>60</sup> *Act. Tr.*, Degraasi, 74f., 547; Livy, *Per.* 15; Dion. Halic. 20, 17; Front. *Strateg.* I, 12, 3; Vell. Pat. II, 14; Plin. *NH* XXXIII, 44; Flor. I, 14; Eutrop. II, 16; Zonar. VIII, 7; Broughton 1951/1952, 199–200; Laffi/Pasquinnucci/Gabba 1975, 16; Delplace 1993, 4; Bandelli 2008, 348; Luni 2004, 74–75. However, there are no details of these activities of the 269 and 268 consuls.

<sup>61</sup> Strabo 5, 4, 13 (C 251); Pseudo-Scylax 11; Toynbee 1965, I: 224–225, 240–241, 300; II: 119; Laffi/Pasquinnucci/Gabba 1975, 15–16. The Ligurian tribes in Cisalpine Gaul were similarly dealt with; they were displaced to Samnium in 180, 179 and 175: *CIL* IX 1445; Livy XL, 16; 17; 25–28; 41; 53; XLI, 12; 14; 18; XLII, 7–8, 22, 5–6; Flor. I, 20; Toynbee 1965, II: 279; Salmon 1967, 79, 310–311, 396; Brunt 1971, 189; Dyson 1985, 104–110. Deportation was, therefore, a frequently used tool in the Roman expansion policy in Italy.

<sup>62</sup> At the same time as Ariminum, another Latin colony was founded in the south of Italy – Beneventum in Samnium, on the spot of a former settlement of an Oscan tribe of the Hirpini – Maleventum: Livy, *Per.* 15; Vell. Pat. I, 14; Eutrop. II, 16; Toynbee 1965, I: 86; Salmon 1969, 63; Bandelli 2002a, 74.

<sup>63</sup> Strabo 5, 2, 9 (C 226); Ewins 1952, 54; Toynbee 1965, I: 281; II: 57; Bernardi 1985, 72–73; Ziółkowski 1994, 65. Ariminum became not only a *claustrum*, barring the Celts from entering Italy, but also an attack base

south (Sicily) against hitherto allied Carthage. It also cannot be ruled out that Rome wanted to ensure an advantageous position (*claustrum*) for its future activities against the Celts in Cisalpine Gaul. Despite the truce signed with the Boii in 282/281, Rome decided to send probably 6,000 settlers, both citizens and allies with families, to the area close to the old Etruscan settlement of Arimna.<sup>64</sup> The settlers received much bigger plots than the inhabitants of citizen colonies, which was supposed to compensate them for the loss of some of their citizens' rights (in the case of Roman citizens) and to ensure their survival in a place that was both unknown and far away from Rome. The inhabitants of Ariminum and subsequent colonies founded on the basis of the *ius XII coloniarum* (*ius Ariminensium*) received extensive advantages with regard to inheritance law and buying and selling regulations.<sup>65</sup> The distributed lands stretched between the River Aprusa Crustumium (Ausa Conca) in the south and the rivers of Utens or Utis in the south-west (Rubicon?).<sup>66</sup> This territory was probably subject to centuriation twice, first in 268, and later in 232. The colony itself was encircled by a wall of irregular shape, but quite strong, which confirms the defensive function of the settlement.<sup>67</sup> Unfortunately, we do not know who the *tresviri coloniae deducendae* were – their task was to prepare and select the spot for the settlement and to bring in the settlers.

Even less can be said about the colony at Firmum, mentioned above, which was undoubtedly a Latin colony. Its status is confirmed by bronze coins with the legend *FIR*; by inscriptions, which provide information about the offices typical for Latin colonies; and by literary texts, which indirectly indicate the colony's status. On the basis of archaeological data, researchers estimate the size of the colony at 10 to 12.5 hectares, and the community inhabiting Firmum at 2,500–4,000 families.<sup>68</sup>

---

for many of Rome's military actions in Cisalpine Gaul: Livy XXX, 18–19; Salmon 1969, 88–89; Bispham 2006, 90; Piegoń 2009, 131–133.

<sup>64</sup> The heterogeneous origins of the people of Ariminum are confirmed by inscriptions: *CIL* VI 133; XI 379 = *ILS* 6664 and by Strabo 5, 1, 11 (C 216). See Toynbee 1965, I: 138 n. 2 and 3, 251 n. 3; Bandelli 1988, 12–17; Ziolkowski 2004, 180; Bispham 2006, 91; Bradley 2006, 173–174. Some historians believe there were 4,000 settlers, but it seems that the number 6,000 is closer to the truth; therefore, there could have been more than 18,000 and fewer than 24,000 settlers including families (multiplier: Caes. *BG* I, 29; Bandelli 1999, 192; Suder 2003, 126). See Ewins 1952, 54 n. 2; Bandelli 1988, 7; 1999, 193. This is why Ariminum was described by the term *claustrum*, as above.

<sup>65</sup> Cic. *Caec.* 35, 102: *...ipse ita tulit de civitate, ut non sustulerit horum nexa atque hereditates...; ...a civibus Romanis hereditates capere posse...*

<sup>66</sup> Plin. *NH* III, 115: *Octava regio determinatur Arimino, Pado, Appennino. in ora fluvius Crustumium, Ariminum colonia cum amnibus Arimino et Aprusa, fluvius Rubico, quondam finis Italiae. ab eo Sapis et Utis et Anemo, Ravenna Sabinorum oppidum cum amne Bedese, ab Ancona CV, nec procul a mari Umbrorum Butrium*; Ewins 1952, 54; Cassola 1962, 210; Toynbee 1965, I: 85; II: 670–671; Brunt 1971, 167; Laffi 1987, 41; Oebel 1993, 54–74; Bonora 2000, 57–58. The Latin status of Ariminum is also confirmed by bronze coins minted in the colony, with the legend *ARIMN*, and inscriptions with offices typical of Latin colonies: *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 40 = *ILLRP* 77 (consuls); *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 2029a = *ILLRP* 545; *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 2029b = *ILLRP* 545 (duoviri); Salmon 1969, 86; Bandelli 2002b, 35; Bispham 2006, 108–110.

<sup>67</sup> Salmon 1969, 27; Chouquer/Favory 1983, 321.

<sup>68</sup> Vell. Pat. I, 14, 8: *At initio primi belli Punici Firmum et Castrum colonis occupata.*; *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 383 = *ILLRP* 593 (quaestors); Salmon 1969, 86; Polverini 1987, 19–31, 55–64; Bandelli 2008, 345, 348–349; Pelgrom 2008, 353 n. 30 (the area of the land distributed for the establishment of the colony is estimated at 10 ha!). The colonists joined the *tribus* Velina: *CIL* IX 5351 = *ILS* 6132 = *ILLRP* 593; Petruccia Lucernoni 1988, 186–187.



There is also little that can be said about the last colony founded in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century in the *ager Gallicus*, i.e. Aesis, also known as Aesium (present-day Iesi). We do not know the circumstances and reasons why it was founded even though there were already three Latin colonies in the *ager Gallicus et Picenum* – Hadria, Ariminum and Firmum – and two citizen ones – Sena Gallica and probably Castrum (Novum). All that has been established so far is the date of the foundation, i.e. probably 247, and the fact that it was a citizen colony. Aesis was built on the south border of the *ager Gallicus*, in the middle stretch of the River Aesis, which marked the southern border of the *ager Gallicus*, and quite far from the Adriatic coast.<sup>69</sup>

Aesis was not the last Roman colonial settlement initiative in the territories of the *ager Gallicus et Picenum*. After the deportation of most of the inhabitants of Picenum and the extermination of the Celtic Senones, there was still a considerable reservoir of free land to be peopled on the central coast of the Adriatic. Despite the foundation of three large Latin colonies (Hadria, Ariminum, and Firmum) and three smaller citizen colonies (Castrum Novum, Sena Gallica and Aesis), the area still offered considerable settlement possibilities. It seems that on the one hand the Romans found it hard to distribute such a large territory, and on the other hand there were conflicting opinions in Rome as to how and when the lands should be distributed. It is difficult to say what the possible dispute looked like, but it probably concerned the form of land division, i.e. whether to continue granting land to settlers in colonies, or to distribute it by grants to individual settlers. One argument for the first option was the danger related to the appearance in 236, i.e. after the truce ended, of the Boii and their allies *Gaesatae* at Ariminum. They did not threaten the colony, since as a result of internal conflicts instead of conquering the colony the two groups started to fight against each other, leading to their annihilation without Roman intervention (sic!).

However, in 232, the option of granting plots to individual settlers (*adsignationes viritanae*) won; one of its advocates was the plebeian tribune of 232, G. Flaminius Nepos. It was G. Flaminius, a *homo novus* on the Roman political scene, who passed the *lex Flaminia de agro Piceno Gallico viritim dividundo*. The pro-aristocracy historic sources (Polybius, Livy) considered him to be a populist and a political trouble-maker. In the opinion of the unsympathetic sources, the reason behind his postulate to divide and assign plots *viritim* was solely the desire to win over supporters.<sup>70</sup> It seems, however, that the initiative was not only an element of propaganda, but also an attempt to implement, albeit against the Senate, the Roman plan of putting the conquered lands to use. Most likely, the Senate, in accordance with the political and legal tradition, was going to carry out its own settlement project (perhaps a new colony or also *adsignationes viritanae*?), and consequently decide on its own what would become of the undistributed land. Meanwhile the tribune, who went on to cause a great deal of trouble for the establishment, completed his own project of distribution against the Senators' wishes during a plebeian

<sup>69</sup> Vell. Pat. I, 14, 8; Strabo 5, 2, 10 (C 227); Ptol. III, 1, 46; Toynbee 1965, I: 184; Salmon 1969, 180 n. 119–120; Harris 1971, 156; Bandelli 1988, 6; 2002a, 74; 2002b, 35–37; Oebel 1993, 89; Paci 2002, 90; Piegoń 2009, 133.

<sup>70</sup> Polyb. II, 21; Cic. *Brut.* 14, 57; Livy XXI, 63; Val. Max. V, 4, 5; Toynbee 1965, I: 167; Bandelli 2002a, 77, 80; 2003, 50; Luni 2004, 79–83 (the extent of the distributed lands determined on the basis of inscriptions). See Toynbee 1965, I: 311–315.

assembly (*plebiscitum*). Naturally, this move won him the support and acclaim of the Roman *populus*, since it was probably carried out in the best interests of those without land. It seems that the objective of G. Flaminius Nepos' initiative was not only to win the people's favour; in actual fact it was supposed to replace wastelands with land cultivated by Roman citizens favoured by the tribune. It may seem like an absurd idea to people a front territory, between the Rivers Esino, Musone (in the north) and Chienti (in the south), with individual settlers (20,000–30,000 people), due to the danger faced by the settlers from the warlike Celtic neighbours from the north. However, the absurdity of this move is only apparent if we consider that the new settlers were not thrown onto a completely hostile territory but sent to an area which had been in Roman hands for over half a century and had been partially colonised before. Three colonies had been founded there (Sena Gallica, Ariminum, Aesis), which had put down roots and could provide protection for individual settlers. The new settlers joined the Roman *tribus* of the rural Pollia.<sup>71</sup>

The later activity of the plebeian tribune of 232 indicates that his interest in the affairs of the northern territories of Italy was not just a matter of trying to endear himself to the Roman people. Chosen as a consul or censor, he was successful in connecting the *ager Gallicus* to Rome by a road called the *Via Flaminia* in 223 or 220,<sup>72</sup> and actively participated in war campaigns against the Celts from northern Italy in 224–222, e.g. as consul he fought against the Insubres in 223.<sup>73</sup> His actions were always criticised and attacked by the Senate, but he disregarded the rules of the aristocratic class, supporting, for example, some efforts against the aristocracy. He was also the initiator of a law called the *lex Claudia de senatoribus* in 218, which was not welcome by the senatorial aristocracy, and he was probably able to count on the support of the emerging order of equites.<sup>74</sup>

Roman colonisation in the *ager Gallicus* made the Gallic tribes, especially the Boii, feel threatened by Rome. The Boii managed to ally themselves with their closest neighbours, the Insubres, as well as the Lingones and the Taurini, and to hire the mercenaries from across the Alps, the Gaesatae. In 225, a mighty Gallic army of 50,000 infantry and 20,000 cavalry invaded the south.<sup>75</sup> The great Roman victory over the Celtic forces at Telamon became a turning point in the history of the territories between the River Po and the Alps, as the Romans began to attack the Celtic and Ligurian tribes in the same

<sup>71</sup> Ewins 1952, 54; Taylor 1960, 96; Toynbee 1965, I: 177, 386–387; Forni 1989, 57; Bandelli 2002a, 78; Piegoń 2009, 133–135.

<sup>72</sup> Toynbee (1965, I: 311–326) draws attention to the role of Roman aristocracy in ruling the Republic, including its considerable involvement in the distribution of the *ager publicus*, and emphasises the role of its outstanding opponents – M'. Curius Dentatus and G. Flaminius Nepos: Gabba 1979, 159–163; 1990, 70; Vishnia 1996, 25–34 *contra* Salmon 1969, 103. See Bandelli 1988, 22–24; 2002a, 76–78; 2003, 50; Brizzi 2002, 55–60; Ziolkowski 2004, 264–265, 269, 291–294; Ungern-Sternberg 2005, 316–322. The estimated number of settlers in the *ager Gallicus* is taken from Bandelli 1999, 194. See Oebel 1993; Vishnia 1996, 20.

<sup>73</sup> Polyb. II, 32–33; Livy, *Per.* 20; Plut. *Marcell.* 6; Dion 12, 50, 4; Càssola 1962, 218–228; Toynbee 1965, II: 265; Dyson 1985, 31; 97; Kruta/Manfredi 1999, 155–158; Piegoń 2009, 85. Flaminius, against the Senate's wishes, held a triumph for his victory against the Insubres (*sic!*).

<sup>74</sup> Livy XXI, 63, 3: *...ne quis senator cuive senator pater fuisset maritimam navem quae plus quam trecentarum amphorarum esset haberet...*; Càssola 1962, 216–219; Toynbee 1965, I: 228; Wiseman 1971, 68; Ziolkowski 2004, 252–253; Ungern-Sternberg 2005, 316–322. The role of the emerging order of equites in the Republic's policy in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century is emphasised by Càssola 1962, 25–83.

<sup>75</sup> Polyb. II, 22–23; Plut. *Marcell.* 3–4; Brunt 1971, 185–186; McDonald 1974, 45–46; Harris 1992, 198–199; Luraschi 1979, 3; Dyson 1985, 29; Gabba 1990, 70.

year, which started a long period of conquest of Cisalpine Gaul.<sup>76</sup> With this victory it also seems that the fear of the Celtic threat, which had been at the back of Roman minds since the defeat at Allia, became a thing of the past. The fear of the *metus gallicus* was replaced by the desire to expel the hated enemy from northern Italy, especially since the conquest of Cisalpine Gaul meant new, very fertile territories for settlement and colonisation for the more and more numerous citizens and the takeover of the natural resources in the region.<sup>77</sup>

The victories and the conquest of northern Italy would probably not have been possible without the earlier Roman activity in Picenum and on the old territories of the Celtic Senones (*ager Gallicus*) and in Umbria. The territories became not only a place protected by Rome and its allies from Celtic invasions from northern Italy, but also an area for launching attacks against the Celts. If we also add the above-mentioned initiative of G. Flaminius Nepos, who built an important artery of the *Via Flaminia* in 223 or 220 connecting Rome with the already subordinated territories of Umbria and the *ager Gallicus* in northern Picenum and with the Adriatic coast,<sup>78</sup> we will be able to see the full range of Roman instruments for building their hegemony in Italy.

The most serious challenge to the Roman domination in Italy was, certainly, the Second Punic War, which shook the foundations of the Republic's power but did not break it. Over a decade of fights against Hannibal in Italy and on the other fronts of this war showed some cracks in the structure of the Roman hegemony in Italy. The destruction of war affected a considerable part of Italy, including territories on the central Adriatic coast. It was not the main front of military operations, but Hannibal's forces stayed in Picenum and nearby Umbria for some time after their victory at Lake Trasimene in 217, thoroughly destroying the lands, plundering, and murdering many of the inhabitants (probably settlers). The Republic kept military units in Picenum during the conflict, and the Latin colonies of Hadria, Ariminum and Firmum supported Rome by sending provisions and reinforcements.<sup>79</sup> The Latin colonies of Hadria/Hatria and Firmum were also casualties of the operations of the Carthaginian forces, as their territories were sacked.<sup>80</sup>

As has already been mentioned, the events of the Second Punic War had a great influence on the Republic's relations with its Italian allies and on the process of colonising

<sup>76</sup> Polyb. II, 31; Gabba 1990, 71: "È da questo momento che i Romani si resero conto che l'eliminazione definitiva del pericolo gallico per l'Italia centrale era realizzabile soltanto con la conquista della Valle Padana, che le vittorie sui Galli dimostravano oramai possibile."

<sup>77</sup> Polyb. II, 31; Harris 1992, 199–200; Vishnia 1996, 23–24; Ziolkowski 2004, 194.

<sup>78</sup> *Via Flaminia*: ILS 84; Livy, *Per.* 20; Strabo 5, 1, 11 (C 217); Tac. *Ann.* III, 9, 1; Wiseman 1970, 124, 138, 140–144; Radke 1973, 1540–1575; Delplace 1993, 8; Laurence 2011, 21–23; Luni 2004, 83–85. Based on Livy's opinion (XXXIX, 2, 10), it is believed that the *Via Flaminia* ended at Ariminum. Not everybody agrees with this opinion: Felicioli 1987, 81–138.

<sup>79</sup> Polyb. III, 86, 8–11; 87; Livy XXII, 9, 1–5; XXIII, 14, 1–4; XXIV, 10, 1–5; 11, 1–4; 44, 1–5; XXV, 3, 1–7; XXVII, 43, 11–12; 44, 10–11; Strabo 5, 4, 13 (C 251); App. *Hann.* 9, 11; Eutrop. III, 18; Toynbee 1965, II: 10–11, 58, 526–527; Salmon 1969, 82–91; Alfieri 1986, 7–22; Delplace 1993, 8, 27–28. It is possible that the inhabitants of Ausculum, allied with Rome, took part in the battle of Cannae in 216: Livy XXIII, 14, 2–3 (vague mention of reinforcements from Picenum); XXIII, 32, 16–20 (recruitment of soldiers in Picenum); Silius Italicus *Punica* IV, 175; 176; V, 208; VIII, 438; IX, 273; X, 312; Laffi/Pasquinnucci/Gabba 1975, 16–17. The Roman legions also crossed Picenum in 207, while marching against the Carthaginian troops under the command of Hasdrubal, Hannibal's brother, who was defeated by the Romans in the Battle of the Metaurus.

<sup>80</sup> Salmon 1969, 89.

Italy. Rome maintained its hegemony in Italy (defeated in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries), apart from Cisalpine Gaul. Gradually, at the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, Rome abandoned the policy of founding Latin colonies in favour of Roman colonies of a new type, increasing the number of settlers in the new colonies and the plots granted. Interestingly, the new *coloniae civium Romanorum* also appeared in the *ager Gallicus*, i.e. in northern Picenum – Pisaurum (present-day Pesaro), as well as in the south of the region – Potentia (present-day Potenza). Information about the foundation in 184 of both of these citizen colonies indicates how great the size of the conquered area on the central Adriatic coast (Picenum and *ager Gallicus*) must have been, seeing as it was still possible to found colonies even after granting plots to settlers from six colonies and after completing individual settlement projects. Both colonies were founded at the same time, close to the Adriatic coast, a little over 100 kilometres apart.<sup>81</sup> The whole project was overseen by the same *tresviri coloniae deducendae*: Q. Fabius Labeo, M. Fulvius Flaccus, and Q. Fulvius Nobilior. These were meritorious and influential statesmen and generals.<sup>82</sup> The colonists, whose number is estimated at 2,000, received generous plots of land – six *iugera* per person.<sup>83</sup> The history of both colonies shows an active involvement of high-ranking Roman officials in the internal affairs of the *coloniae civium Romanorum*. In 174, the censor Q. Fulvius Flaccus persuaded the authorities of several colonies, including Potentia and Pisaurum, to make internal investments. At the censor's suggestion, a temple of Jove was built and a road paved at Pisaurum, as well as water being supplied to Potentia (an aqueduct was built?).<sup>84</sup>

Discussing the censors' initiatives in 174, Livy also mentions the censors' involvement in the matter of constructing defence walls and erecting buildings (shops?) in the area around the forum, e.g. in Auximum (present-day Osimo), another settlement

<sup>81</sup> Livy XXXIX, 44; Vell. Pat. I, 15; Salmon 1969, 104; Toynbee 1965, II: 145 ("coastguard colonies"!); 208; Harris 1971, 152; Moscatelli 1987, 395–402; Delplace 1993, 14; Luni 2004, 87–88. It is difficult to say whether the initiative to found both colonies on the Adriatic coast was connected with the situation in Macedonia, where Rome backed the younger son of Philip V, Demetrius, and pushed him to inherit the throne, and in Illyria (against Gentios), cf. Bandelli 1985, 68. The foundation of citizen colonies near the coast was not unusual in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century; apart from Pisaurum and Potentia in 177 the Latin colony of Luna was founded not far from the sea, cf. Salmon 1969, 104. Pisaurum may have been built on the spot where an earlier settlement had existed, and the colony's name is probably derived from the nearby river, cf. Braccisi 1984, 2–6. The colonists at Pisaurum were diverse socially and, interestingly, also ethnically; the Roman poet Q. Ennius, who had come from the Oscan town of Rudiae (the Salentines allied with Rome), was an inhabitant of Pisaurum or Potentia: Cic. *Brut.* 20; 78; *Arch.* 9; Gell. *NA* 17, 17, 1: *Quintus Ennius tria corda habere sese dicebat, quo loqui Graecae et Oescae et Latine sciret*; Toynbee 1965, I: 192; II: 149 n. 1, 431, 667; Harris 1971, 159 n. 6, 175 n. 4, 177, 196; Braccisi 1984, 7; Luni 1988, 37–50.

<sup>82</sup> Toynbee 1965, II: 202; Braccisi 1984, 6–7. Delplace (1993, 16–18) identified the *tresviri coloniae deducendae*; cf. Broughton 1951/1952, 406.

<sup>83</sup> Livy XXXIX, 44; Toynbee 1965, II: 147; Salmon 1969, 24, 104–105, who estimates the number of colonists in both settlements on the basis of the number of colonists in other citizen colonies. Estimating the area of the colonies (23 ha at Potentia and 17 ha at Pisaurum) on the basis of archaeological research can also help to estimate the size of the community in both colonies, see Delplace 1993, 14, 23–24; Luni 2004, 88. Possibly, a *conciliabulum civium Romanorum* had existed there before the colony at Pisaurum was founded: Braccisi 1984, 7.

<sup>84</sup> Livy XLI, 27, 5–13. The censors' activities are described in detail by Delplace 1993, 19–23. See Toynbee 1965, I: 233 n. 1; II: 208 n. 2; Sherwin-White 1973, 84–85; Luni 2004, 89–90.

in the *ager Gallicus* in Picenum.<sup>85</sup> This is one of the first mentions (Livy) about this settlement, which was probably a citizen colony. There is some confusion resulting from the fact that other sources (Velleius Paterculus) date the colony's foundation to a later period, i.e. 157/156,<sup>86</sup> and some contemporary historians (E.T. Salmon) even to the times of the Gracchi brothers (128), whose agrarian reform could have also affected Picenum, as confirmed by inscriptions and the *Liber coloniarum*.<sup>87</sup> Auximum's citizen status is also confirmed by literary sources and, mainly, inscriptions, which mention offices typical for citizen colonies.<sup>88</sup> The colonists at Auximum were given as many as eight *iugera* of land.<sup>89</sup> Unlike Pisaurum and Potentia, Auximum was located farther from the Adriatic, similarly to Aesis founded in 247. The colony's location far from the coast may mean that factors other than strategic (economic and social) ones were decisive when Auximum was founded. The colonists joined the *tribus* Velina, as confirmed by the majority of inscriptions from the region.<sup>90</sup>

Founding Latin and citizen colonies and building settlements were not the only methods of subordinating and transforming the region of Picenum and the *ager Gallicus*. Colonial settlement organised by the state was most likely complemented by spontaneous settlement actions of the people, about which we have almost no information. Undoubtedly the colonies themselves were not the only settlements created on the lands which were being peopled. We should also remember smaller places, such as *fora*, *concialiabula*, *vici* etc., which were founded on those territories by Rome and its officials.<sup>91</sup> Together with colonies, they played an important role in the process of Romanisation of Picenum and the *ager Gallicus*. Colonies and smaller settlements of non-native population were connected with one another and with native settlements by a network of roads, many of which were built in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, but the majority in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, the prime example being the *Via Flaminia*.

<sup>85</sup> Livy XLI, 27, 5–13 (interpretations of Livy's fragment provided by Gentili 1955, 31; 56–62, 67; Toynbee 1965, II: 208 n. 2; Delplace 1993, 15); Plut. *Pomp.* 6. On belonging to Picenum, see Strabo 5, 4, 2 (C 241); Plin. *NH* III, 13, 111; Gentili 1955, 34–35.

<sup>86</sup> The problems related to the chronology of the foundation of the colonies at Pisaurum, Potentia and Auximum are discussed by Delplace 1993, 14.

<sup>87</sup> *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 719 = XI 6331; *Liber coloniarum*, p. 258 Lachmann: *Ausimatis ager limitibus Gracchanis per centurias est adsignatus*; Toynbee 1965, II: 209 n. 1, 241; Salmon 1969, 112, 113, 115, 118; Harris 1971, 150 n. 6; Delplace 1993, 28–29; Luni 2004, 90–92. The citizen colony at Auximum may have been built in place of an earlier settlement with the status of *forum*: Toynbee 1965, II: 208 n. 2.

<sup>88</sup> Hirtius *BC* 12; Plut. *Pomp.* 6; *CIL* IX 5839, 5841, 5843, 5849, 6384 (praetors); IX 5841, 5842 (aediles); IX 5823, 5828, 5843, 5855, 5856 (decurions); Gentili 1955, 43–44. See Bispham 2007, 101–103.

<sup>89</sup> Gentili 1955, 33.

<sup>90</sup> *CIL* IX 5830–5833, 5838, 5840, 5842 (Velina); Gentili 1955, 33. A few inscriptions name other *tribus* such as Claudia, Lemonia, and Collina. Auximum, like the whole of Picenum, played an important role as a place of recruitment in the 1<sup>st</sup> century, during the civil wars: Hirtius *BC* I, 12; 13; 31; Plut. *Pomp.* 6; Lucan *Phars.* II. On the reasons why Auximum was founded, see Salmon 1969, 112, 113–115, 118.

<sup>91</sup> Frayn 1993; Bispham 2007, 87–91.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alfieri, N. (1986): La battaglia del Lago Plestino, *Picus* 6: 7–22.
- Antonelli, L. (2003): *I Piceni. Corpus delle fonti. La documentazione letteraria*, Roma.
- Badian, E. (1958): *Foreign Clientelae* 264 – 70, Oxford.
- Badian, E. (1967): *Roman Imperialism in the Late Republic*, Pretoria.
- Bandelli, G. (1981): La guerra istrica del 221 a.C. e la spedizione alpina del 220 a.C., *Athenaeum* n.s. 59: 3–28.
- Bandelli, G. (1985): La presenza italica nell'Adriatico Orientale in età repubblicana (III–I secolo a.C.), *Antichità Altoadriatiche* 26: 59–84.
- Bandelli, G. (1988): *Ricerche sulla colonizzazione romana della Gallia Cisalpina: le fasi iniziali e il caso aquileiese*, Roma.
- Bandelli, G. (1999): La popolazione della Cisalpina dalle invasioni galliche alla guerra sociale, in: *Demografia, sistemi agrari, regimi alimentari nel mondo antico. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi (Parma 17–19 ottobre 1997)*, Bari: 189–215.
- Bandelli, G. (2001): Roma e l'Adriatico fra III e II secolo a.C., *Antichità Altoadriatiche* 54: 17–42.
- Bandelli, G. (2002a): Roma e l'Italia centrale dalla battaglia del Sentino (295 a.C.) al plebiscito di Gaio Flaminio (232 a.C.), in: *La battaglia del Sentino. Scontro fra nazioni e incontro in una nazione. Atti del Convegno di Studi Camerino-Sassoferrato, 10–13 giugno 1998*, Roma: 63–80.
- Bandelli, G. (2002b): La colonizzazione medio-adriatico fino alla seconda guerra punica: questioni preliminari, *Quaderni di archeologia nella Marche* 11: 21–54.
- Bandelli, G. (2003): Aquileia colonia latina dal senatus consultum del 183 a.C. al supplementum del 169 a.C., *Antichità Altoadriatiche* 54: 49–76.
- Bandelli, G. (2008): Romani e Picenti dalla stipulazione del foedus (299 a.C.) alla deduzione di Firmum (264 a.C.), *Quaderni di archeologia nella Marche* 14: 337–352.
- Bernardi, A. (1985): Cremona, colonia latina a nord del Po, Cremona Romana, in: *Atti del congresso storico archeologico per il 2200 anno di fondazione di Cremona (Cremona, 30–31 maggio 1982)*, Cremona: 71–82.
- Bishpam, E. (2006): *Colonium Deducere*: How Roman was Roman Colonization During the Middle Republic?, in: G. Bradley, J.-P. Wilson (eds.), *Greek and Roman Colonization. Origins, Ideologies and Interactions*, Swansea: 73–160.
- Bishpam, E. (2007): *From Asculum to Actium. The Municipalization of Italy from the Social War to Augustus*, Oxford.
- Bonora, G. (2000): La centuriazione nell'Emilia orientale, in: *Aemilia. La cultura romana in Emilia Romagna dal III secolo a.C. all'età constantiniana*, Venezia: 57–63.
- Braccesi, L. (1984): Lineamenti di storia pesarese in età antica, in: *Pesaro nell'antichità. Storia e monumenti*, vol. I, Venezia: 1–38.
- Braccesi, L. (2007): Terra di confine archeologia e storia tra Marche, Romagna e San Marino, *APXAIOMFIKA archeologia, epigrafia, storia* 1, Roma.
- Bradley, G. (2000): *Ancient Umbria. State, Culture, and Identity in Central Italy from the Iron Age to the Augustan Era*, Oxford.
- Bradley, G. (2006): Colonization and Identity in Republican Italy, in: G. Bradley, J.-P. Wilson (eds.), *Greek and Roman Colonization. Origins, Ideologies and Interactions*, Swansea: 161–188.
- Brizzi, G. (2002): La via Flaminia e la guerra annibalica, *Quaderni di archeologia nella Marche* 11: 55–60.
- Broughton, T.R.S. (1951/1952): *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, vol. I–II, New York.
- Brunt, P.A. (1971): *Italian Manpower 225 B.C.–A.D. 14*, Oxford.
- Brunt, P. (2001): *Roman Imperial Themes*, Oxford.

- Burton, P.J. (2012): *Friendship and Empire. Roman Diplomacy and Imperialism in the Middle Republic (353–146 B.C.)*, Cambridge.
- Calderazzo, L. (1997): Arbitrati romani in Cisalpina (197–89 a.C): problemi e status quaestionis, *Rivista di Studi Liguri*, Bordighera: 25–46.
- Campagnoli, P. (1999): *La bassa valle del foglia e il territorio di 'Pisaurum' in età romana*, Imola.
- Càssola, F. (1962): *I gruppi politici Romani nel III sec. a.C.*, Trieste.
- Càssola, F. (1972): La politica romana nell'Alto Adriatico, *Antichità Altoadriatiche* 2: 43–63.
- Chouquer, G., Favory, F. (1983): Cadastrements antiques de Campanie, du Latium méridional et de Romagne, in: *Cadastrés et espace rural. Approches et réalités antiques*, Besançon: 318–321.
- Colonna, G. (1984): Etruschi nell'ager Gallicus, *Picus* 4: 95–105.
- Corbett, J.H. (1971): Rome and Gauls 285–280 B.C., *Historia* 20: 656–664.
- Cornell, T. (1995): *The Beginnings of Rome. Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000–264 BC)*, London–New York.
- Cornell, T. (2002): The End of Roman Imperial Expansion, in: J. Rich, G. Shipley (eds.), *War and Society in the Roman World*, London–New York: 139–170.
- Crawford, M.H. (1995): La storia della colonizzazione romana secondo i Romani, in: A. Storch Marino (ed.), *L'incidenza dell'antico. Studi in memoria di Ettore Leppore I. Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Anacapri 24–28 marzo 1991*, Naples: 187–192.
- Delplace, Ch. (1993): *La romanisation du Picenum: l'exemple d'urbs Salvia*, Rome.
- Dench, E. (1995): *From Barbarians to New Men*, Oxford.
- Dench, E. (1997): Sacred Springs to the Social War: Myths of Origins and Questions of Identity in Central Italy, in: T. Cornell, K. Lomas (eds.), *Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Italy*, London: 43–52.
- Dumitrescu, V. (1929): *L'età del ferro nel Piceno fino all'invasione dei Galli-Senoni*, Bucarest.
- Dyson, S. (1985): *The Creation of the Roman Frontier*, Princeton.
- Eckstein, A.M. (2007): Conceptualizing Roman Imperial Expansion under the Republic: An Introduction, in: P. Erdkamp (ed.), *A Companion to the Roman Army*, Oxford: 567–589.
- Edmondson, J. (1993): *Instrumenta Imperii: Law and Imperialism in Republican Rome*, in: B. Halpern, D.W. Hobson (eds.), *Law, Politics and Society in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Sheffield: 156–192.
- Ewins, U. (1952): The Early Colonisation of Cisalpine Gaul, *PBSR* 20: 54–71.
- Felicioli, D. (1987): Il problema della Flaminia originaria in territorio marchigiano, in: *Atti e memorie 88–91 (1984–1986). Le strade nelle Marche. Il problema nel tempo Atti del convegno Fano, Fabriano, Pesaro, Ancona (11–14 ottobre 1984)*, Ancona: 81–138.
- Fieconi, A. (1996): *In Appenninis Alpihus. Circoscrizioni antiche e medievali tra Marche e Umbria*, Ancona.
- Forni, G. (1989): La tribu Velina degli aquilesi, *Antichità Altoadriatiche* 35: 51–81.
- Fortini, P. (1981): *Cupra Maritima origini, storia, urbanistica*, Ascoli.
- Fortini, P. (1995): *Cupra Marittima: aspetti di vita economica di una città romana del Picenum attraverso l'esame dell' instrumentum domesticum*, in: *Civiltà contadina e civiltà marinara nella marca meridionale e nei rapporti tra le due sponde dell'Adriatico. Atti del 7° Seminario di studi per il personale direttivo e docente della scuola*, Cupra Marittima: 39–170.
- Frayn, J. (1993): *Markets and Fairs in Roman Italy. Their Social and Economic Importance from the Second Century BC to the Third Century AD*, Oxford.
- Gabba, E. (1979): Caio Flaminio e la sua legge sulla colonizzazione dell'agro gallico, *Athenaeum* LXVII: 159–163.
- Gabba, E. (1989): Rome and Italy in the Second Century, in: *CAH*, vol. VIII: 197–244.
- Gabba, E. (1990): La conquista della Gallia Cisalpina, in: *Storia di Roma*, vol. II: *L'impero mediterraneo. La repubblica imperiale*, Torino: 69–78.
- Gargola, D.J. (1995): *Lands, Laws & Gods. Magistrates & Ceremony in the Regulation of Public Lands in Republican Rome*, Chapel Hill–London.
- Gentili, G.V. (1955): *Auximum (Osimo). Regio V – Picenum*, Roma.

- Hall, J. (2011): *Historia Grecji archaicznej ok. 1200–479 p.n.e.*, Kraków.
- Harris, W.V. (1971): *Rome in Etruria and Umbria*, Oxford.
- Harris, W.V. (1992): *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome 327–70 B.C.*, Oxford.
- Humbert, M. (1978): *Municipium et civitas sine suffragio. L'organisation de la conquête jusqu'à la guerre sociale*, Rome.
- Jehne, M. (2009): *Diplomacy in Italy in the Second Century BC*, in: C. Pilers (ed.), *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*, Leiden–Boston: 143–171.
- Keppie, L. (1983): *Colonisation and Veteran Settlement in Italy, 47–14 B.C.*, Rome.
- Krawczuk, A. (1960): *Kolonizacja sullańska*, Wrocław.
- Kruta, V. (1981): Les Sénons de l'Adriatique d'après l'archéologie (prolégomènes), *Études celtiques* 18, 7–38.
- Kruta, V. (1992): Materiali senonici del Piceno e arte celtica, in: *La civiltà picena nelle Marche. Studi in onore di Giovanni Annibaldi Ancona 10/13 luglio 1988*, Maroni (Regioni Marche): 388–401.
- Kruta, V., Manfredi, V.M. (1999): *I Celti in Italia*, Milano.
- Laffi, U. (1987): L'amministrazione di Aquileia in età romana, *Antichità Altoadriatiche* 30: 39–62.
- Laffi, U. (2007): *Colonie e municipi nello stato romano*, Roma.
- Laffi, U., Pasquinucci, M., Gabba, E. (1975): *Asculum I*, Pisa.
- Laurence, R. (2003): Territory, Ethnonyms and Geography. The Construction of Identity in Roman Italy, in: R. Laurence, J. Berry (eds.), *Cultural Identity in the Roman World*, London–New York: 95–110.
- Laurence, R. (2011): *The Roads of Roman Italy. Mobility and Cultural Change*, London–New York.
- Lazenby, J. (2012): *Pierwsza wojna punicka*, Zasole.
- Lomas, K. (2003): Roman Imperialism and the City in Italy, in: R. Laurence, J. Berry (eds.), *Cultural Identity in the Roman World*, London–New York: 64–78.
- Luni, M. (1988): Popolamento e sistemazione agraria nell'ager Pisauensis, *Picus* 8: 37–50.
- Luni, M. (2004): *Archeologia nelle Marche. Dalla preistoria all'età tardoantica*, Firenze.
- Luraschi, G. (1979): *Foedus Ius Latii Civitas – Aspetti costituzionali della romanizzazione in Transpadana*, Padova.
- McDonald, A.H. (1974): The Roman Conquest of Cisalpine Gaul (201–191 B.C.), *Antichthon* 8: 44–53.
- Morley, N. (2010): *The Roman Empire. Roots of Imperialism*, New York.
- Moscattelli, U. (1987): La viabilità litoranea tra Potentia e Sacrata in età romana, in: *Atti e memorie 88–91 (1984–1986). Le strade nelle Marche. Il problema nel tempo Atti del convegno Fano, Fabriano, Pesaro, Ancona (11–14 ottobre 1984)*, Ancona: 395–402.
- Mostardi, B.F. (1977): *Cupra*, Ascoli.
- Mouritsen, H. (1998): *Italia Unification. A study in Ancient and Modern Historiography*, London.
- Naso, A. (2002): *I Piceni. Storia e archeologia delle Marche in epoca preromana*, Milano.
- Oakley, S. (2002): The Roman Conquest of Italy, in: J. Rich, G. Shipley (eds.), *War and Society in the Roman World*, London–New York: 9–37.
- Oebel, L. (1993): *Flaminus und die Anfänge der römischen Kolonisation im Ager Gallicus*, Frankfurt am Main.
- Paci, G. (1998): Pisaurum: sui magistrati della colonia, *Picus* 18: 246–252.
- Paci, G.F. (2002): Conseguenze storico-politiche della battaglia di Sentino per i popoli a nord del fiume Esino, in: *La battaglia del Sentino. Scontro fra nazioni e incontro in una nazione. Atti del Convegno di Studi Camerino-Sassoferrato, 10–13 giugno 1998*, Roma: 81–94.
- Pallottino, M. (1991): *A History of the Earliest Italy*, London.
- Patterson, J.R. (2006): Colonization and Historiography: The Roman Republic, in: G. Bradley, J.-P. Wilson (eds.), *Greek and Roman Colonization. Origins, Ideologies and Interactions*, Swansea: 189–218.
- Pelgrom, J. (2008): Settlement Organization and Land Distribution in Latin Colonies before the Second Punic War, in: L. de Ligt, S. Northwood (eds.), *People, Land, and Politics. Demographic Developments and the Transformation of Roman Italy 300 BC–AD 14*, Leiden–Boston: 333–372.



- Percosi Serenelli, E. (1990): La "civiltà picena", in: *Dalla rivoluzione neolitica all'età dei metalli. Atti del 2° Seminario di studi per personale direttivo e docente della scuola*, Cupra Marittima: 155–190.
- Petraccia Lucernoni, M.F. (1988): *I Questori Municipali dell'Italia Antica*, Roma.
- Peyre, C. (1979): *La Cisalpine gauloise du III<sup>e</sup> au I<sup>er</sup> siècle avant J.-C.*, Paris.
- Piegdóń, M. (2009): *Galia Przedalpejska. Studia nad rzymską obecnością w północnej Italii w III–I w. p.n.e.*, Kraków.
- Pietrangeli, C. (1943): *Otriculum (Otricoli)*, Roma.
- Polverini, L. (1987): Fermo in età romana, in: L. Polverni, N.E. Parise, S. Agostini, M. Pasquinucci (eds.), *Firmum Picenum I*, Pisa.
- Purcell, N. (1990): The Creation of Provincial Landscape: The Roman Impact on Cisalpine Gaul, in: T. Blagg, M. Millet (eds.), *The Early Roman Empire in the West*, Oxford: 7–29.
- Radke, G. (1973): *Viae publicae Romanae*, *RE* S.XIII: 1415–1686.
- Rich, J. (2002): Fear, Greed and Glory: The Causes of Roman War-Making in the Middle Republic, in: J. Rich, G. Shipley (eds.), *War and Society in the Roman World*, London–New York: 38–68.
- Riva, C. (2007): The Archaeology of Picenum: The Last Decade, in: G. Bradley, E. Isayev, C. Riva (eds.), *Ancient Italy. Regions without Boundaries*, Exeter: 79–113.
- Salmon, E.T. (1967): *Samnium and the Samnites*, Cambridge.
- Salmon, E.T. (1969): *Roman Colonisation under the Republic*, Lund.
- Salmon, E.T. (1982): *The Making of Roman Italy*, London.
- Scheidel, W. (2006): The Demography of Roman State Formation in Italy, in: M. Jehne, R. Pfeilschifter (eds.), *Herrschaft ohne Integration? Rom und Italien in republikanischer Zeit*, Stuttgart: 207–226.
- Sherwin-White, A.N. (1973): *The Roman Citizenship*, Oxford.
- Smith, R.E. (1954): Latins and Roman Citizenship in Roman Colonies: Livy 34, 42, 5–6, *JRS* 44: 18–20.
- Sonocchia, S. (2008): Le fonti classiche greche e latine sui Piceni, *Quaderni di archeologia nelle Marche* 14: 49–76.
- Speranza, G. (1900): *Il Piceno dalle origini alla fine d'ogni sua autonomia*, vol. I, Ascoli.
- Staveley, E.S. (1994): Rome and Italy in the early third century, in: *CAH*, vol. VII, 2: 420–456.
- Suder, W. (2003): *Census populi. Demografia starożytnego Rzymu*, Wrocław.
- Taylor, L.R. (1960): *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic*, Roma.
- Thomsen, R. (1947): *The Italic Regions from Augustus to the Lombard Invasion*, Copenhagen.
- Tibiletti, G. (1965): La romanizzazione della Valle Padana, in: E. Gabba, P. Tozzi (eds.), *Storie locali dell'Italia romana*, Pavia: 27–36.
- Toynbee, A.J. (1965): *Hannibal's Legacy. The Hannibalic War's Effects on Roman Life*, vol. I–II, London.
- Ungern-Sternberg von, J. (2005): The End of the Conflict of the Orders, in: K.A. Raaflaub (ed.), *Social Struggles in Archaic Rome. New Perspectives on the Conflict of the Orders*, Oxford: 312–332.
- Vishnia, R.F. (1996): *State, Society and Popular Leaders in Mid-Republican Rome 241–167 B.C.*, London–New York.
- Wiseman, T.P. (1970): Roman Republican Road-Building, *PBSR* 38: 122–152.
- Wiseman, T.P. (1971): *New Men in the Roman Senate, 139 B.C.–A.D. 14*, Oxford.
- Ziółkowski, A. (1994): Podbój Italii przez Rzym. Motywy i mechanizmy, in: J. Wolski, A. Kunisz (eds.), *Starożytny Rzym we współczesnych badaniach*, Kraków: 49–80.
- Ziółkowski, A. (2004): *Historia Rzymu*, Poznań.